NATIONAL
ARCHIVES
MICROFILM
PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY

215

ROLL

28

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 28

October 9, 1916 - June 9, 1919

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 28

The three volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1916 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; (2) "Minutes / 1917 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; and (3) "Minutes / 1918 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 9, 1916, to June 9, 1919.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 9, 1916, to June 11, 1917; the second, from October 1, 1917, to June 10, 1918; and the third, from October 7, 1918, to June 9, 1919.

VOLUME

1916

At the Capitol of the United States in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the second Monday of October (being the ninth day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixteen and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-first, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice said:

"On the 24th of July last the Honorable John H. Clarke, Judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, was appointed

vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Ju
Hughes, and on the 1st day of August the oa
office required by section 1756 of the Revise
was administered to Judge Clarke by the C
Justice. Mr. Justice Clarke is now present a
ready to take his seat. The clerk will read t
mission and will then administer to Mr. Ju
Clarke the oath pointed out by section 257
Judicial Code."

The clerk then read the commission, and
istered the oath, which commission and oat
the following words, viz:

Woodrow Wilson,
President of the United States of Ameri
To all who shall see these presents Greeting
Know Ye; That reposing special trust and
dence in the Wisdom, Uprightness and Lear
John H. Clarke, of Ohio, I ha
inated, and by and with the advice and c
of the Senate, do appoint him Associate J
the Supreme Court of the United States, and
thorize and empower him to execute and fu
duties of that office according to law, and to
hold the said Office, with all the powers, p
and emoluments thereunto of right appertain
him, the said John H. Clarke, during his g
havior.

In testimony whereof, I
caused these letters to b
patent and the seal of

hereunto affixed.

Seal

Given under my hand, at the City of Washington, the twenty-fourth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty first.

(Signed) Woodrow Wilson.

By the President:
(Signed) T. W. Gregory.
Attorney General.

I, John H. Clarke, do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.

(Signed) John H. Clarke.

Subscribed and sworn
to before me this ninth
day of October, 1916.
(Signed) James D. Maher
Clerk of the Supreme Court

The Chief Justice announced that as the President of the United States was absent from the city the usual visit to him would not be made, and that the Court would receive motions for admission to the bar and other motions noticed for today and which were ready for submission, and that the call of the docket would commence tomorrow pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Caldwell, it is ordered that George J. Danforth, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

* → See p. 35.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that William Smith Rial, Esquire, of Greensburg, and David Wallerstein, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania; Berkeley Pearce and Thomas H. Bushnell, Esquires, of Cleveland, State of Ohio; Julian A. Gregory and Edward K. Sumerwell, Esquires, of New York City; and Charles Woodbury Arth, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is

L. Welborn, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Vir-
ginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this be-
half by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered
that Ray Rushton and Benjamin P. Crum,
Esquires, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be
admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors
f this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. George A. Mahan, it is ordered that
Delany Mahan, Esquire, of Hannibal, State of
Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney
nd counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
ccordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. G. Thomas Dunlop, it is ordered that
dwin Allan Semple, Esquire, of Washington,
District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as
n attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he
as sworn accordingly

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. R. Walton Moore, it is ordered that
harles C. Le Forgee, Esquire, of Decatur, State
f Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this
by Mr. Edward W. Nevis it is ordered that
R. Jewett, Esquire, of Manchester, State of
be admitted to practice as an attorney and
lor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingl

On motion first made to the Court in this
by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that
Edward Thomas, Esquire, of Washington, D
of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an a
ney and counsellor of this Court, and he was
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be
by Mr. Edward C. Turner it is ordered that
M. Calland, Esquire, of Columbus State of Oh
be admitted to practice as an attorney and co
sellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingl

On motion first made to the Court in this beh
by Mr. Walter B. Guy it is ordered that C. Ch
Caywood, Esquire, of Washington, District of
Columbia, be admitted to practice as an a
ney and counsellor of this Court, and he was
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his b
by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, it is ordered that
Henry F. Tibbetts, Esquire of Wilmington, Stat

Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. Evans, it is ordered that William D. Funk, Esquire, of Bloomfield, State of Nebraska, and W. C. Bibb, Esquire of Louisa, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Francis B. James, it is ordered that Edward S. Moulinier and William R. Collins, Esquires, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Graves, it is ordered that Roane Waring and Ike W. Crabtree, Esquires, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, it is ordered that Myer Nussbaum and John Granville Meyers, Esquires of New York City and T. Clay Lindsey, Esquire ted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Louis Glickman, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Crawford, it is ordered that Leon P. Lewis, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Pierce, it is ordered that Mark L. Burns, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

139	F. Drew Caminetti vs. Petitioner The United States	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass these cases.
163	Maury I. Diggs, vs. Petitioner, The United States	
464	L. T. Hays vs. Petitioner The United States,	

286	Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Sargent Land Co.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court, a motion to pass these causes.
287	Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner vs. Sutton Land Co.	
288	Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Keewenaga Land Co.	
309	John Z. Lowe, Junior, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Samuel T. Hubbard, Walter C. Hubbard, and W. Hustace Hubbard.	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby,

John Z. Lowe, Junior,
Collector of United States
Internal Revenue for the
Second District of the
State of New York,
388 vs. Defendants in Error,
Stephen M. Weld, Edward
M. Weld, Philip B. Weld,
Webb Floyd and Henry E.
Thompson.

In Error to the District
Court of the United
States for the Southern
District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of
America,
481. vs. Appellant,
The United States Steel
Corporation et al.

Mr. Solicitor General
Davis, of counsel for
the appellant, submitted
to the consideration of
the Court a motion to
advance this cause.

Louisville Bridge Co.,
546 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General
Davis, of counsel for
the appellee, submitted

the Court a motion to advance this cause.

State of North Dakota, Complainant,
Original. vs.
State of Minnesota.

Mr. M. H. Boutelle of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

State of South Dakota, Complainant,
Original. vs.
State of Minnesota.

Mr. M. H. Boutelle of counsel for the complainant submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

Erie Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
[illegible] vs.
Byron B. Marietta.

Mr. N. M. Wolfe, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, suggested the death of Byron B. Marietta, the defendant in error in this cause, and moved the Court to make Evelyn J. Purucker, Administratrix of the said Byron B. Marietta, deceased, the party defendant in error herein. Whereupon It is now here ordered by the Court that Evelyn J. Purucker, as Administratrix of Byron B. Marietta, deceased, be, and she is hereby, made the party defendant in error in this cause.

Monday, October 9th, 1916, continued

Harry T. Hall, Superintendent, etc.,
438 vs. Appellant,
The Geiger-Jones Co.
Harry T. Hall, Superintendent, etc.
439 vs. Appellant
Don C. Coultrap
Harry T. Hall, Superintendent, etc., et al.
440 vs. Appellants
William R. Rose et al.

On motion of Mr. Robert R. Reed in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in these cases as amicus curiae.

The Savings Bank of Danbury, Conn.,
723 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Dietrich E. Loewe, as surviving partner, &c.

Mr. Daniel Davenport, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the case

Wellsville Oil Co.,
541 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Martha Miller et al.

The motion [illegible] dismiss or affirm in this cause so to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Robert J. Boone in support of the same, and Mr. James A. Veasey and Mr. [illegible] in opposition thereto.

No. 11

John Gund Brewing Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The Great Northern Railway Co., et al.

Mr. Levi Cooke, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

639

Mrs. Laura L. Bunch,
Petitioner
vs.
J. E. Mulaney, as Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. E. Hemingway, Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. J. F. Loughborough and Mr. V. M. Miles in support of the same, and Mr. J. M. Moore in opposition thereto.

1 Original

The State of Georgia,
Complainant
vs.
The Tennessee Copper Co. et al.

Mr. Arthur G. Powell, of counsel for The Tennessee Copper Co., submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a stipulation and agreement as to further proceedings herein and as to the continuance of the cause as to the defendant, The Tennessee Copper Company.

642

The Stearns & Dillard Co.
Petitioner
vs.
Mike Minks

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, October 4th, 1926, continued

Silver King Coalition Mines Co.
574. vs. Petitioner.
Conkling Mining Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Curtis H. Lindley, Mr. William Howard Dickson, Mr. Thomas Marioneaux and Mr. A. C. Ellis, Jr. in support of the same, and Mr. Edward B. Critchlow, Mr. W. D. McHugh and Mr. William H. King in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Clair D. Vallette and Alfred B. Quinton,
Original. Petitioners.

Mr. A. B. Quinton, of counsel for the petitioners in this cause submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a hearing on an application for leave to bring a bill of complaint in the name of The United States against the State of Florida.

Florence C. Dinwiddie et al.,
673. vs. Petitioners,
Nathan Hazel Metzger et al. Executors, &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, Mr. Stanton C. Peelle and Mr. A. A. Hoehling Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Victor H. Walton and Mr. J. J. Darlington

Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.,
642 vs. Appellant.
Robert L. Greene et al.,
etc., et al.
Robert L. Greene et al.,
etc., et al.,
643 vs. Appellants
Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.
Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.
644 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene, et al.,
etc., et al.
Robert L. Greene et al.,
etc., et al.,
645 vs. Appellants,
Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.

Mr. W. W. Millan,
in behalf of counsel,
submitted to the con
sideration of the
Court a motion to
advance these cases

David Clement, as Ad-
ministrator, etc.,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
Chicago, Milwaukee & St.
Paul Railway Co., et al.

The petition for a
writ of certiorari
herein was submit-
ted to the considera
tion of the Court by
Mr. Burton K.
Wheeler and Mr. H. Lowndes Maury in suppor
of the same.

686 H. Snowden Marshall,
vs. Appellant.
Robert B. Gordon, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, &c.

Mr. Henry M. Goldfogle, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

679 Atlas Portland Cement Co.,
vs. Petitioner
Fred. W. Hixon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George A. Mahan and Mr. Dulany Mahan in support of the same, and Mr. Elliott W. Major in opposition thereto.

511 United Drug Co.,
vs. Petitioner
Theodore Rectanus Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick L. Emery in support of the same.

666 The Gilchrist Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
Erie Specialty Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Charles E. Riordan in support of the same, and Mr. J. L.

Keystone Coal & Coke Co.,
704 vs. Petitioner
Michael Fekete (substituted for Charles Young) administrator etc.
Keystone Coal & Coke Co.
705 vs. Petitioner
Frank Thuy (substituted for Charles Young) as administrator, etc.
Keystone Coal & Coke Co.
706 vs. Petitioner
Anna Helenbinger (substituted for Charles Young) as administrator, etc.
Keystone Coal & Coke Co.
707 vs. Petitioner,
Adam Walker

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the court on printed arguments by Mr. Berkeley Pearce, Mr. William S. Reed and Mr. James S. Moore, [illegible] in support of the same and Mr. George H. Eichelberger in opposition thereto

Jesse Isidor Straus et al. etc.,
374 vs. Petitioners.
Victor Talking Machine Co.

Mr. Edmond E. Wise, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum,
663 vs. Petitioner
Sue B. Behrend.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

printed arguments by Mr. Norman E. Wiggins in support of the same and Mr. W. Benjamin Carter in opposition thereto.

F. F. Slocomb & Co. (Inc.),
78 vs. Petitioners,
A. C. Layman Machine Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks in support of the same and Mr. William Steele Jackson and Mr. Charles Howson in opposition thereto.

Isidor Straus et al., trading
as R. H. Macy & Co.,
184 Oct. Term 1915 vs. Petitioners.
Notaseme Hosiery Co.

A motion to reform the decree of this Court in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks, of counsel for the respondent, in support of the same, and Mr. Edmund E. Wise, of counsel for the petitioners, in opposition thereto.

Ida A. Van Dyke et al.,
52 vs. Appellants,
W. Paul Geary et al., etc.,
et al.

Mr. William C. Prentiss, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass this cause.

Monday, October 9th, 1916 continued

619 Ben Levy et al., Liquidating Agents, etc.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Walter Ozzard.

Mr. E. A. Cohen in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to extend the time in which to file statement of points and designation of parts of the record to be printed in this cause.

566 John G. Meyers et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward K. Summerwell and Mr. Gilbert D. Lamb in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

578 Montgomery Traction Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Montgomery Light & Water Power Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Ray Rushton and Mr. Gregory L. Smith in support of the same, and Mr. R. E. Steiner, Mr. John R. Tyson and Mr. Benjamin P. Crum in opposition thereto.

17 Mountain Timber Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Washington.

On motion of counsel for all the parties in this cause, leave is hereby granted to file the opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington rendered since this cause was argued and submitted.

691 The State of Ohio,
vs. Petitioner
Aaron A. Ferris,
Receiver etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward C. Turner and Mr. Clarence D. Laylin in support of the same, and Mr. Aaron A. Ferris in opposition thereto.

426 Southern Pacific Co. et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Darnell-Taenzer Lumber Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch and Mr. H. D. Minor, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in support of the same, and leave was granted Mr. Francis B. James, of counsel for the defendant in error to file a brief in opposition thereto within two days.

426 Southern Pacific Co. et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Darnell-Taenzer Lumber Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the

Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Francis B. James and Mr. Allen Hughes in support of the same, and Mr. Charles N. Burch, Mr. H. D. Minor, Mr. Fred. H. Wood, Mr. Robert Dunlap, Mr. T. J. Norton, Mr. Blewett Lee and Mr. H. A. Scandrett in opposition thereto.

678 W. A. Gage & Co. et al.
vs. Petitioners
Robert Wilson (successor to J. W. Brown) as trustee, &c.

702 Commercial Trust & Savings Bank et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Robert Wilson (successor to J. W. Brown) as trustee, &c.

708 Interstate Banking & Trust Co.
vs. Petitioner
Robert Wilson (successor to J. W. Brown) as trustee, &c.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, of counsel for the petitioners in No. 678; by Mr. H. J. Livingston, Mr. William P. Metcalf and Mr. William H. Fitzhugh, of counsel for the petitioners in No. 702, and by Mr. Roane Waring, Mr. Luke E. Wright and Mr. J. W. Canada, of counsel for the petitioner in No. 708, in support of the same and by Mr. Jno. W. Crabtree in opposition thereto.

The Town of Newbern et al.,
698. vs Petitioners,
National Bank of Barnesville, Ohio

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Marion G. Evans in support of the same, and Mr. William R. Collins in opposition thereto.

Memphis Street Railway Co.,
622. vs. Petitioner
J. W. Bobo, as Administrator etc.
Memphis Street Railway Co.
623 vs. Petitioner,
S. C. Moore, Administrator, &c.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Roane Waring and Mr. Luke E. Wright in support of the same, and Mr. Caruthers Ewing and Mr. Ike W. Crabtree in opposition thereto.

The Arizona Copper Co., Ltd.,
477 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph B. Hammer
The Arizona Copper Co., Ltd.,
478 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Richard Bray

The motions to dismiss or affirm in these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank H. Hereford in support of

Mr. John A. Garver in opposition thereto

55 P. J. Hamill
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
The Joseph Schlitz
Brewing Co.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass this cause.

67 The Hart Steel Co., et al.
vs. Petitioners,
The Railroad Supply Co.
95 The Railroad Supply Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

Mr. Taylor E. Brown, of counsel for the respondent in No. 67 and the petitioner in No. 95, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass these causes.

[illegible] P. L. Crane,
vs. Appellant,
Hiram W. Johnson,
Governor, &c., et al.
[illegible] Kate P. McNaughton,
vs. Appellant,
Hiram W. Johnson,
Governor, etc., et al.

Mr. Tom L. Johnson, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these causes.

[illegible] Emilio Valdez
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
The United States

Mr. C. B. Ellis in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to

Court a motion to reassign this cause.

678 The Spring Garden Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Pa., Petitioner, vs. T. Gilbert Wood, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George Bryan and Mr. Gustavus Remak, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Fred. Harper in opposition thereto.

354 Gulf Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Texas Packing Co., et al.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. O. Cox in support of the same, and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. J. W. Terry, Mr. A. H. Culwell, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne in opposition thereto.

675 Grinnell Washing Machine Co., Petitioner, vs. E. E. Johnson Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles C. Linthicum and Mr. Melville Church in support of the same, and Mr. Taylor E. Brown and Mr. Clarence E.

771 The T. H. Symington Co.,
vs. Petitioner
The National Malleable
Castings Co. et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter in support of the same.

792 William L. Taylor et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Charles H. Kimmerle,
Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harris F. Williams in support of the same, and Mr. Clyde W. Ketcham in opposition thereto.

808 Daisy M. Linkous,
Administratrix, &c.,
vs. Petitioner.
The Virginian Railway Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter L. Welborn and Mr. W. J. Henson in support of the same, and Mr. Walter H. Taylor in opposition thereto.

808 Daisy M. Linkous,
Administratrix, &c.,
vs. Petitioner.
The Virginian Railway Co.

Mr. Walter L. Welborn, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause.

687 Frank Tedowska
vs. Petitioner,
The United States
688 James Oates,
vs. Petitioner
The United States
689 Hiram Stephens
vs. Petitioner
The United States
690 Fannie Bullens,
vs. Petitioner
The United States

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alton B. Parker and Mr. John C. Palmer, Jr., in support of the same.

638 Inter Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
George E. Ward.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. A. Douthitt in support of the same, and Mr. William O. Smith in opposition thereto

579 Chicago Title & Trust Co., Trustee, &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
Fred J. Zuttermeister

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles L. Bartlett and Mr. George Gillette in support of the

Henry C. Kramer in opposition thereto

The State of Minnesota,
Original vs. Complainant,
The State of Wisconsin

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Minnesota
Original vs. Complainant.
The State of Wisconsin

Mr. Lyndon A. Smith, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

98
Henry H. Kayser,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edward H. Wilson

Mr. Lyndon A. Smith in behalf of counsel, suggested the death of Edward H. Wilson the defendant in error in this cause and moved the Court to enter Ida S. Wilson and J. E. Dunn administrators of the said Edward H. Wilson, deceased as parties defendants in error herein. Whereupon, It and J. E. Davis as Administrators of Edmund H. Wilson, deceased, &c. and they are hereby made the parties defendants in error in this cause.

669 John H. Frederickson, vs. Petitioner. G. H. Renard, as Executor, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William V. Allen in support of the same, and Mr. R. E. Evans and Mr. William D. Funk in opposition thereto.

585 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., vs. Petitioner. Carl Kilmer,

586 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., vs. Petitioner. Edgar A. Emens, as Executor, &c.

587 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., vs. Petitioner. Edgar A. Emens as Executor, &c.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick M. Pelzmann, Mr. Daniel W. Baker and Mr. David Wiener in support of the same, and Mr. Walter W. Magee in opposition thereto.

588 William W. Crawford, Trustee, vs. Petitioner. Washington Northern Railroad Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

Mr. James A. Reeves and Mr. E. S. McCord, in suppo of the same, and Mr. Zeno Brown and Mr. Wallace W. Emmons in opposition thereto.

586	Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., vs. Appellant, Western Union Telegraph Co.	Mr. John K. Graves, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
617	Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., etc., et al., vs. Appellants, Louisville & Interurban Railroad Co.	Mr. John K. Graves, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to consolidate and advance these cases.
618	Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., etc., et al., vs. Appellants, Louisville Railway Co.	
584	Annie L. Hanson, vs. Petitioner, Walter L. Hanson.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court, on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Nash Rockwood in support of the same, and Mr. Ralph S. Rounds in opposition thereto.

648 Beverly R. Robinson, as trustee, etc., vs. Petitioner, Charles F. Rae.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter C. Noyes and Mr. B. W. B. Brown in support of the same, and Mr. Henry W. Taft in opposition thereto.

30 Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., vs. Appellant, The United States.
58 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., vs. Appellant, The United States.

On motion of Mr. Harvey M. Friend in that behalf leave is hereby granted him to file a brief in these cases as amicus curiae.

587 John G. Christopher et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Jane Mungen et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Nathan P. Bryan and Mr. J. T. G. Crawford in support of the same, and Mr. George C. Bedell in opposition thereto.

[illegible]	The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Kansas ex rel. S. M. Brewster, Attorney General of the State of Kansas, and J. T. Botkin, Secretary of State of the State of Kansas	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kan

It appearing to the Court that an authority of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said authority, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

199	Terre Haute, Indianapolis & Eastern Traction Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Elmira C. Weddle, Administratrix of the Estate of Homer Weddle, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

224

Florida East Coast Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson Burr et al., as Railroad Commissioners of Florida

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

225

Florida East Coast Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error.
vs.
The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson Burr et al., as Railroad Commissioners of Florida.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

238 Walter Bowne & Co., Incorporated, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

281 S. B. Hovey et al., Receivers, etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Fayette Tankersley. In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

352. Serapion Uribe et al.,
vs. Appellants,
R. E. Manly et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

448 John Grant Lyman,
vs. Appellant,
Thomas D. McCarthy, Marshal of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co.,
517 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. C. Ellsworth.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bert L. Hunt, it is ordered that Green H. Hackworth, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, October 10th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan, it is ordered that Edward A. Huggins, Esquire, of Columbus, and Andrew M. McCarty, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert W. De Forest, it is ordered that Charles Edward Miller, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis M. Phelps, it is ordered that Louis E. Hart, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nicholas W. Hacker, it is ordered that Frank W. Wheaton, Esquire, of Wilkes Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

139	F. Drew Caminetti, Petitioner, vs. The United States.	On consideration of the motion to pass these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.
163	Maury I. Diggs, Petitioner, vs. The United States.	
464	L. T. Hays, Petitioner, vs. The United States	

286	Fred. Von Baumbach, Collector, &c., Petitioner, vs. Sargent Land Co.	On consideration of the motion to pass these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted
287	Fred. Von Baumbach, Collector, &c., Petitioner, vs.	

288 Fred Von Baumbach,
Collector, &c.,
vs. Petitioner.
Sargent Land Co.

361 Emilio Valdez
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States

On consideration of the motion to reassign this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

52. Ida A. Van Dyke et al.
vs. Appellants,
W. Paul Gray et al., &c., et al.

On consideration of the motion to pass this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

55 P. J. Hamill,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co.

On consideration of the motion to pass this case, It is now here ordered by the Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

It is ordered that the letter of resignation of the Reporter of this Court, Charles Henry Butler, Esq., and the response of the Court thereto be entered upon the minutes of

Washington, October 5, 1916

To the Chief Justice and Associate Justices
of the Supreme Court of the United States:

I hereby tender my resignation as Reporter of this Court to take effect on the appointment of my successor.

I cannot do this without thanking you for the kindness and consideration which I have received from all the members of the Court during the fourteen terms I have had the honor of reporting their decisions.

Very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
Chas. H. Butler.

Supreme Court of the
United States
October 9, 1916.

Dear Sir:

In informing you of the acceptance of your resignation we desire to convey our abiding sense of the courtesy and consideration which you have so uniformly manifested during the many years in which you have been Reporter and our appreciation of the zealous purpose to discharge fully your duty which has controlled you during that long period.

We cannot refrain from hoping that the enlarged field of professional endeavor, the desire to enter upon which has caused you to sever your fit in good results as you expect it to be, and that you may enjoy a long, happy and useful life.

Very truly yours,
Edward D. White,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
J. C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.

Charles Henry Butler, Esq.

And it is further ordered that Mr. Ernest Knaebel, of Colorado, be, and he is hereby, appointed Reporter of this Court in the place of Charles Henry Butler, Esq., resigned, and is charged with the duty of reporting the decisions of the present term from its commencement.

566 The Miller Rubber Co. et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Citizens Trust and Savings Bank, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff and Mr. Winfield Scott Bixler in support of the same, and Mr. Henry S. Van Dyke in opposition thereto.

Cynthia Lindley,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner.
Chicago Burlington &
Quincy Railroad Co.

Mr. A. B. Quinton, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing in this cause.

Charles W. Parker et al.
891 vs. Petitioners.
Edgar W. Ross, Guardian &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Louis E. Hart and Mr. John R. Montgomery in support of the same, and by Mr. Harrison Musgrave and Mr. W. S. Oppenheim in opposition thereto.

The Enterprise Irrigation District et al.
395 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The Tri-State Land Co. et al.

On motion of Mr. Ernest Knaebel in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

Manufacturers Railway Co. et al.
[illegible] vs. Appellants.
The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument

457 Beekman Winthrop, et al.,
vs. Appellants.
Grant Fellows, as Attorney
General of the State of
Michigan, et al.

The orde
John J
in behalf
It is orde
Court tha
be, and th

hereby, passed subject to the provisions of
rule 26.

484 The Missouri, Kansas &
Texas Railway Co., of
Texas et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Mrs. Emma A. Cassady
Administratrix, etc.

The motion
to affirm
was subm
consideratio
Court on th
printed arg
Mr. H. L.

support of the same and Mr. Joseph M.
Mr. Alexander Britton in opposition

324 The United States of
America.
vs. Appellant.
Reading Co. et al.

339 Reading Co. et al.
vs. Appellants
The United States of
America.

On motion
Solicitor General
counsel for The
States of America
hours are allowed
side in the argu
these cases.
The argument
menced by Mr.

to the Attorney General, Todd, of counsel for T
States of America, and continued by Mr. Ja
Reynolds, of counsel for the Reading Co.

Robert W. De Forest, of counsel for the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Wednesday, October 11th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John Foster Dulles, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that William W. Ray, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that William Bohleber, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

711 Elliott Varnish Co., Petitioner, vs. Sears, Roebuck & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. C. Linthicum, Walter H. Chamberlin and D. S. Wegg in support of the same, and Mr. Lincoln B. Smith in opposition thereto.

103 Dan S. Lehon, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Atlanta.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Samuel D. Hewlett in support of the same, and Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, Mr. Marion Smith and Mr. Max F. Goldstein in opposition thereto.

200 F. A. Dickson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Luck Land Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Marshall A. Spooner in support of the same, and Mr. Frank Healy in opposition thereto.

Wednesday, October 18th 1916, continued

324 The United States of America, Appellant vs. Reading Co. et al.
559 Reading Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. John G. Johnson, of counsel for The Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States of America.

202 Utah Power & Light Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.
203 The United States, Appellant, vs. Utah Power & Light Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. W. V. Hodges, of counsel for the Utah Power & Light Co., and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for The United States and Mr. Graham Sumner, of counsel for the Utah Power & Light Co.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, October 12th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Jessy Benedict Gessner, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert J. Campbell, it is ordered that Harold V. Ahlberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Stanley B. Houck, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

13 Original. The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

On motion of Mr. John T. Barker, of counsel for the complainant, leave is hereby granted to file the application in this cause.

13 Original. The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

Mr. John T. Barker, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file an application for the appointment of a commissioner in this cause.

386 Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General, et al., Appellants, vs. The Sioux Falls Stock Yards Co., et al.

413 Frank W. Merrick, et al., Appellants, vs. N. W. Halsey & Co., et al.

Mr. George J. Danforth, of counsel for the appellees in No. 386, submitted to the consideration of the Court a suggestion that these cases be heard immediately after cases Nos. 438, 439 and 440.

41 Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. B. B. Saunders, Administrator of Henry Saunders, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that

counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by the Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

458 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. L. Cowan et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. B. D. Warfield and Mr. Charles H. Moorman, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William W. Crawford, of counsel for the defendants in error.

202 Utah Power & Light Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

203 The United States, Appellant, vs. Utah Power & Light Co.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Graham Sumner, of counsel for the Utah Power & Light Co.

204 The Beaver River Power Co., Appellant, vs. The United States

205 The United States, Appellant, vs.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Clyde C. Dawson, of counsel for The

206 Lucius L. Nunn et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States

207 The United States,
vs. Appellant,
Lucius L. Nunn et al.

Co. and Lucius L. Nunn; continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the United States and concluded by Mr. Frank H. Short of counsel for the Beaver River Power Co. and Lucius L. Nunn.

69 The United States of America,
vs. Appellant,
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, October 13th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, it is ordered that Thomas B. Greenwood and W. C. Campbell, Esquires, of Palestine, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Colley W. Bell, it is ordered that L. R. Mason, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

69 The United States of America, Appellant vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant; Mr. E. H. Boles of counsel for the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. and Delaware, Susquehanna & Schuylkill Railroad Co.; Mr. J. W. Wheaton, of counsel for the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., et al., and Mr. John G. Johnson of counsel for the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. and Delaware, Susquehanna & Schuylkill Railroad Co., and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States.

290 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward S. Jouett, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the appellee, The United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Mo

Monday, October 16th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Gregory, it is ordered that E. E. Townes, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Luther Day, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Allan D. Jones, Esquire, of Newport News, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Kremer, it is ordered that Russell Mott, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. B. Gregory, it is ordered that R. L. Ryder, Esquire, of Edwardsville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Henry H. Little, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Lambert, it is ordered that Charles E. Eckstein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. B. Newcomb, it is ordered that Frank M. Cobb, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Bradford, it is ordered that John W. Farley, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis, it is ordered that Charles Cheney Hyde, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hannis Taylor, it is ordered that A. Chester Clark, Esquire, of Concord, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Charles A. Vilas, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

67 The Hart Steel Co. et al.
vs. Petitioners,
The Railroad Supply Co.
95 The Railroad Supply Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

On consideration of the motion and stipulation to pass these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice, however, to the right to renew the same upon the making of a proper showing.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

— Original. State of North Dakota,
vs. Complainant,
State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue returnable on the first Monday in March next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

— Original. State of South Dakota,
vs. Complainant,
State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue returnable on the first Monday in March next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

State of Minnesota,
— Original vs. Complainant.
State of Wisconsin

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue returnable on the first Monday in March next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Edwin D. Vallette and Alfred B. Quinton.
— Original Petitioners

On consideration of the petition for a hearing on a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this Court in the name of The United States vs. The State of Florida, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Georgia
Original vs. Complainant.
The Tennessee Copper Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a stipulation between the complainant and the defendant Tennessee Copper Company, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

184, Oct. Term 1915.
Isidor Straus et al., trading as R. H. Macy & Co., Petitioners, vs. Notaseme Hosiery Co.

On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate and reform the decree herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

704, Oct. Term 1915.
Cynthia Lindsay, Petitioner, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

619
Don Lacy, as liquidating agent of The Oklahoma City National Bank, Pltff in Err. vs. Mollie Ezzard. D

On consideration of the motion to extend the time for filing a designation of the parts of the record to be printed in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
538 vs. Appellant,
Western Union Telegraph Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, but the case will be taken as submitted on printed briefs if counsel are so advised.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
481 vs. Appellant,
The United States Steel Corporation et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the case assigned for argument on Monday February 26th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisville Bridge Co.,
540 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

715 The Savings Bank of [illegible] Danbury, Connecticut, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Dietrich E. Loewe, as surviving partner of the firm of D. E. Loewe & Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

606 H. Snowden Marshall, vs. Appellant, Robert B. Gordon, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives of the United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

370 Jesse Isidor Straus et al., vs. Petitioners, Victor Talking Machine Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned

after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
per Mr. Chief Justice White

P. L. Conner,
493 vs. Appellant,
Hiram W. Johnson,
Governor of the State of
California, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
per Mr. Chief Justice White

Kate S. McNaughton
494 vs. Appellant
Hiram W. Johnson, Governor
of the State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned, for that day.
per Mr. Chief Justice White

Robert L. Greene, Auditor,
et al., constituting The
Board of Valuation and
Assessment for the State
of Kentucky, et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court

Louisville & Interurban Railroad Co.
Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al.,
618 vs. Appellants.
Louisville Railway Co.

Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
642 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al., constituting the Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al.

Robert L. Greene, et al., constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al.,
643 vs. Appellants
Illinois Central Railroad Co.

Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
644 vs. Appellant.
Robert L. Greene et al. constituting The Board of Valuation & Assessment for the State of Kentucky et al.

Robert L. Greene et al., constituting The Board of Valuation & Assessment for the State of Kentucky et al.
645 vs. Appellants
Illinois Central Railroad Co.

tion be, and the same are hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument, as one case, on Monday December 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per
The Chief Justice White

312
John Gund Brewing Co.
vs Appellant,
The Great Northern Railway Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

571
United Drug Co.
vs Petitioner
Theodore Rectanus Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

578
The T. H. Symington Co.
vs Petitioner
The National Malleable Castings Co. and J. J. Byers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

622.	Memphis Street Railway Co. Petitioner. vs. J. W. Bobo, Administrator of the Estate of Walter Owen, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

623.	Memphis Street Railway Co. Petitioner. vs. S. C. Moore, Administrator of the Estate of Guy B. Deyton, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

639

Mrs. Laura L. Bunch,
Petitioner
vs.
J. E. Maloney, as Trustee
in Bankruptcy for The
J. H. Bunch Commission Co.
Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

665.

Supreme Council of
the Royal Arcanum
Petitioner.
vs.
Sue B. Behrend.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

669. John H. Friedrichsen,
vs. Petitioner,
G. H. Renard, as Executor
of the Estate of Edward
Renard, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

675 Grinnell Washing
Machine Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
E. E. Johnson Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

506 John J. Magner et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

513 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Carl Nilsen. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

514 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Edgar A. Emens, as Executor of the last will and testament of Jessie S. Emens, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

515 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Edgar A. Emens, as Executor of the last will and testament of Martha S. Emens, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

518 Montgomery Traction Co., Petitioner, vs. Montgomery Light & Water Power Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

566 The Miller Rubber Co. and The Miller Rubber Co. of California, Petitioners, vs. Citizens Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of W. D. Newerf, doing business as W. D. Newerf Rubber Co., bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

Silver King Coalition Mines Co.,
577 vs. Petitioner.
Conkling Mining Co.

On petition for cer
tiorari to the Un
Circuit Court of
for the Eighth Ci

On consideration of the petition for a writ
rari herein to the United States Circuit Cou
Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the a
of counsel thereupon had, as well as in oppos
against the same, It is now here ordered, by
Court that the said petition be, and the sa
hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice

Chicago Title & Trust Co.,
Trustee of Kuhn Brothers
Bankrupts,
578 vs. Petitioner,
Fred J. Zuttermeister

On petition for a
certiorari to the
States Circuit C
of Appeals for the
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ
rari herein to the United States Circuit Co
Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the
ment of counsel thereupon had, as well as in su
of or against the same, it is now here ordered
Court that the said petition be, and the same
hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice

585

William W. Crawford,
Trustee,
Petitioner,
vs.
Washington Northern
Railroad Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

588

Annie L. Hanson,
Petitioner,
vs.
Walter L. Hanson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William L. Taylor and
Frank H. Millikan
593 vs. Petitioners,
Charles H. Kimmerle, Trustee
in Bankruptcy of the City
Bank of Dowagiac, Lyle,
Gage & Co., et al. Bankrupts.

On petition f
rtiorari to
States Circu
of Appeals fo
Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ
rari to the United States Circuit Court
for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argumen
sel thereupon had, as well in support of
the same, it is now here ordered, by this Co
the said petition be, and the same is here

Per Mr. Chief Justi

The Sturm & Dillard Co.,
618 vs. Petitioner,
Mike Pilcsits.

On petition for w
tiorari to the Un
Circuit Court of
for the Sixth Circ

On consideration of the petition for a writ
rari to the United States Circuit Co
Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the a
of counsel in support of the same, it is now
dered by this Court that the said petition b
the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justic

644	Beverly R. Robinson, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of John W. Van Schaick et al. Petitioner, vs. Charles F. Roe	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

648	Daisy M. Linkous, Administratrix of the Estate of J. M. Linkous, deceased, Petitioner, vs. The Virginian Railway Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

666

The Gilchrist Co.,
vs. Petitioner
Erie Specialty Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice [illegible]

670

The Spring Garden Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, (Pennsylvania),
vs. Petitioner,
T. Gilbert Ward, who sues for the benefit of himself, The Roanoke Sheet Metal Co. and J. P. Ward

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice [illegible]

David Clement, as Administrator of the Estate of David Clement, Jr., deceased.
672 vs. Petitioner,
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Florence E. Dinwiddie, Marion L. Dinwiddie, Etta L. Todd and Lula A. Burton,
673 vs. Petitioners,
Rachel Hazel Metzger and National Savings & Trust Co., Executors of Millard Metzger, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against

aid petition be, and the same is hereby
nied. Per Mr. Chief Justice White

651 Atlas Portland Cement Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Fred W. Hogan

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

678 W. A. Gage & Co., Germania Savings Bank & Trust Co., H. G. Thompson et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Robert Wilson (successor to J. W. Brown) as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Lenoir City Cotton Co. Bankrupt

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

702	Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Citizens Bank & Trust Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. Robert Wilson (successor to J. W. Brown) as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Isaac Ely Cotton Co., Bankrupts.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

703	Interstate Banking & Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Robert Wilson (successor to J. W. Brown) as Trustee for the Bankrupt Estate of Isaac Ely Cotton Co., Bankrupt.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argu-of counsel against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

687 Frank Ladowska, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

688 James Oates, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

689 Miriam Stephens,
Petitioner,
v.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

690 Fanny Sullivan,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

386 Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
v.
The Sioux Falls Stock Yards Co.

413 Frank W. Merrick, et al.,
Appellants,
v.

On consideration of the motion that these cases be heard immediately after cases Nos. 438, 439 and 440, It is now

Court that these cases be heard with cases Nos. 438, 439 and 440, as one case.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

3

Hugo Adelberto Thomsen et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Sir Charles W. Cayzer et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

719

The United States,
vs. Petitioner
Ivar Ingebritsen Bros.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

716

E. Clemens Horst Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Pabst Brewing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas J. Lewis in support of the same, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Willett M. Spooner and Mr. Frank H. Powers in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of the Indiana Transportation Co. Original Petitioner.

Mr. Charles E. Kremer, of counsel for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause.

183 Eugenia Teillard, et al. Appellants, vs. Enrique Cerra et al.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, suggested the death of Eugenia Teillard, one of the appellants in this cause, and moved the Court to make Jorge Dard y Teillard, Luisa Dard y Teillard, and Nelly Dard y Teillard, heirs at law of the said Eugenia Teillard, deceased, parties appellants herein in place of the said Eugenia Teillard, deceased. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that Jorge Dard y Teillard, Luisa Dard y Teillard, and Nelly Dard y Teillard, heirs at law of Eugenia Teillard, deceased, be, and they are hereby made parties appellants in this cause.

537 James R. Smith et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Jr., and Mr. Peter F. Dunne in support of the

Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

616

William Lewis et al., as
Executors, etc.,
vs Petitioners,
Caledonian Insurance
Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. A. Moore in support of the same, and Mr. Garrett G. Walter in opposition thereto, and leave was granted counsel for the respondents to file an additional brief on or before Thursday next.

629

Chicago & Northwestern
Railway Co.,
vs Petitioner,
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Wheeler in support of the same.

377

John Hamilton Brown,
surviving claimant, &c.,
vs Appellant,
The United States.

Mr. George H. Lamar, of counsel for the appellant, suggested the death of John Hamilton Brown, the appellant, in this cause, and moved the Court to make Oliver B. Saalfield, Administrator of John Hamilton Brown, deceased, the party appellant in this cause. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that Oliver B. Saalfield, as Administrator of John Hamilton Brown, deceased, be, and he is hereby for the appellant herein.

541 Sun Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Union Petroleum Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. E. Townes and Mr. William A. Vinson in support of the same, and Mr. W. D. Gordon in opposition thereto.

542 Joseph W. Bull,
vs. Appellant,
Hugh Campbell, Jr.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. E. Ellsworth in support of the same, and Mr. John R. Van Derlip in opposition thereto.

745 Clarence Griggs et al.,
as Executors, &c.,
vs. Petitioners
Honorable Page Morris,
United States District
Judge, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. William H. Boye in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas Kneeland in opposition thereto.

761

Stanley Lord, Master of
the Steamship "Anglo-
Patagonian"
vs. Petitioner,
William [illegible] et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Henry H. Little and Mr. Robert M. Hughes in support of the same, and Mr. C. Winston Read and Mr. Allan D. Jones in opposition thereto.

326

Thomas Patrick Keys,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of
Illinois

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Patrick J. Lucey and Mr. Silas H. Strawn in support of the same, and Mr. Charles H. Soelke in opposition thereto.

290

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co. et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for The United States, and concluded by Mr. Charles W. Needham, of counsel for The Interstate Commerce Commission.

38 Henry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks, &c., Appellant,
vs.
The Geiger-Jones Co.

39 Henry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks, &c., Appellant,
vs.
Don C. Coultrup.

440 Henry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks, &c., Appellant,
vs.
William R. Rose et al.

586 Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
vs.
The Sioux Falls Stock Yards Co. et al.

448 Frank W. Merrick et al., Appellants,
vs.
N. W. Halsey & Co. et al.

It is ordered by the Court that six hours be allowed for the argument of these cases.

The argument was commenced by Mr. Edward C. Turner, of counsel, for the appellant in cases Nos. 438, 439 and 440, and continued by Mr. Clarence C. Caldwell, of counsel for the appellants in case No. 586, and Mr. Grant Fellows, of counsel for the appellants in case No. 448.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Shauck, it is ordered that Howard S. Smith, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Carpenter, it is ordered that Otto F. Barthel, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Connolly, Theodore K. Bryant, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Detroit United Railway,
5 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Detroit.

On motion of Mr. John C. Donnelly, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

Hugo Adalberto Thomsen et al.,
7 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Hon. Charles H. Cayce et al.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Britton, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 2 rule 26.

Henry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks, etc.,
438 vs. Appellant,
The Geiger-Jones Co.
Henry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks, etc.,
439 vs. Appellant,
Wm. C. Coultrap.
Henry T. Hall, Superintendent

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Grant Fellows, of counsel for the appellants in case No. 438; by Mr. John A. Shauck and Mr. Timothy S. Hogan, of counsel for the appellee in cases Nos. 438, 440 tendent of Banks, &c., Appellant, vs. William R. Rose, et al.

Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General, &c., et al., Appellants,

386 vs. The Sioux Falls Stock Yards Co., et al.

Frank W. Merrick, et al., Appellants,

413 vs. N. W. Halsey & Co., et al.

George J. Danforth, of counsel for the appellees in case No. 386; by Mr. George W. Wickersham and Mr. Robert R. Reed, of counsel for certain appellees in case No. 413; and by Mr. Grant Fellows, of counsel for the appellants in case No. 413, and concluded by Mr. Edward C. Turner, of counsel for the appellants in cases Nos. 438, 439 and 440.

Kansas City, Memphis & Birmingham Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,

213 vs. James P. Stiles.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Forney Johnston and Mr. W. F. Evans, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William L. Martin, of counsel for the defendant in error.

George Schwede,

372 vs. Zenith Steamship Co.

Schwede

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank M. Cobb, of counsel for George

[illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Milton C. Elliott, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, it is ordered that Frank E. Hunter, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas and Martin Caraballo, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins it is ordered that Thomas F. Tickell, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Chapman W. Maupin, it is ordered that Alexander L. Bradford, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. William Hitz, it is ordered that Burnett G. White, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. F. C. Dillard, it is ordered that Hayden W. Head, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

245 Kansas City, Memphis & Birmingham Railroad Co.
(Plaintiff in Error),
vs
James S. Stiles

On motion of Mr. Forney Johnston, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave is to file a supplemental brief in this cause.

132 Abraham Freiberg,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Quinn, Jr.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed, without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

6 The City of Monroe,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Louisiana
ex rel. The Parish Board
of School Directors of the
Parish of Ouachita, Louisiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that this is the second term at which this cause has been called for argument, and that neither party is now prepared to argue the same, it is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the plaintiff in error pursuant to the 16th rule of this Court. Where the Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7	The State ex rel. Willis J. Roussel, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Jared Y. Sanders, Governor, et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.
12.	John F. Colburn, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles T. Wilder, Tax Assessor and Collector for the First Taxation Division of the Territory of Hawaii.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

This cause, having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that this is the second term at which this case has been called for argument, and that neither party is now prepared to argue the same, it is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the plaintiff in error, pursuant to the 19th rule of this Court. Whereupon, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

773 George Edmonds
vs.
Zenith Steamship Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank M. Cobb of counsel for George Edmonds, and by Mr. Luther Day and Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, of counsel for Zenith Steamship Co., and concluded by Mr. R. B. Newcomb, of counsel for George Edmonds.

308 The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

309 The United States Interstate Commerce Commission et al.
Appellants.
vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced, by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, and continued by Mr. John G. Johnson and Mr. Thomas Patterson, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, October 19th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Bradford, it is ordered that Elias Gates, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis E. Horne, it is ordered that Benjamin C. Howard, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, it is ordered that John A. Marion, Esquire of York, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

73

Arnold Mehlos,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of Milwaukee et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

597

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George Robert Kornhoff

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

14. Fremont Lumber Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Nora Reagan.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed temporarily.

15. C. J. Olson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of North Dakota.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed temporarily.

16. John F. Cubbins, Appellant, vs. The Mississippi River Commission et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

17 John F. Conklin, Appellant, vs. Cotton Belt Levee District No. 1, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

322 The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

323 The United States Interstate Commerce Commission et al., Appellants vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The argument of these causes was concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

457 The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Merchants and Manufacturers Traffic Association of Sacramento et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for The United States by Mr. John E. Alexander, of counsel for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Folk of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

412. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Herman H. Oppenheimer, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for The United States, and continued by Mr. Benjamin Slade of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned un

Friday, October 20th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that James Dixon Murphy, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

[illegible] Kansas City, Memphis & Birmingham Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James L. Stiles

On motion of Mr. S. T. Ansell, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief for the de-

Tuesday, October 24th, 1916, continued.

20. The St. Louis Poster Advertising Co., Appellant, vs. City of St. Louis et al.

On motion of Mr. H. A. Haggerty in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

21. Daniel J. Leary, Appellant, vs. The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Jersey City et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

23. Eliot A. de Pass et al., as surviving partners, &c., Appellants, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. H. W. Van Dyke in behalf of counsel for the appellants, It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

25. Frank C. Stettler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edwin V. O'Hara et al., &c.

26. Elmira Simpson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edwin V. O'Hara et al., &c.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed temporarily.

[illegible] The United States, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Herman H. Oppenheimer et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin Slade, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

1 The Detroit United Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Michigan.

2 The Detroit United Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Detroit.

These causes were argued by Mr. Elihu Root, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. P. J. M. Hally, of counsel for the defendants in error.

3 Mary Helen Brown, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of New York. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Nathan T. Sachs, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Charles F. Hibbard, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Terence Farley, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. Charles F. Hibbard, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

[illegible] at 12 o'clock

Monday, October 23rd, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
} Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Harris Carman Lutkin, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Brede, it is ordered that Sidney F. Taliaferro, Esquire, of Fairfax, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

62 Thomas Robert Rogers,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

388 Joseph W. Webb,
vs. Appellant,
Hugh Campbell, Jr.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.
483 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
C. L. Crum and W. A. Griffin, partners doing business under the firm name and style of Crum & Griffin

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. of Texas and American Surety Co. of New York
484 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Mrs. Emma A. Cassady, administratrix of the estate of H. L. Cassady deceased

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for of Texas and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John C. Christopher,
Walter A. Wilson and
W. H. Wilson,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Jane Morgan and Henry
J. Morgan, her husband.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co., Petitioner.
25, Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte. In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co., Petitioner.
25, Original

On consideration of the petition for writ of prohibition herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Kenesaw M. Landis, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, before this Court at the City of Washington, on Monday, December 4th, 1916, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dan S. Lohan, Plaintiff in Error,
107 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

77 The Arizona Copper Co., Limited, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Joseph W. Hammer

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

78 The Arizona Copper Co., Limited, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Richard Bray

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

16 Southern Pacific Co. et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Darnell-Taenzer Lumber Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm and the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

584	Gulf Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Texas Printing Co. et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
34.	Wellsville Oil Co. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Martha Miller nee Emmett and Alpha Oil Co.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
600	F. A. Dickson, vs. Plaintiffs in Error. Luck Land Co.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
539	Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co., vs. Petitioner The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Petitioner,
vs.
[illegible]

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Ohio, Petitioner,
vs.
[illegible], Receiver of The [illegible] Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

693. The Town of Newbern and The Mayor and Aldermen of Newbern, Dyer County, Tennessee, Petitioners, vs National Bank of Barnesville, Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

694. Charles W. Parker and Mary B. Parker, Petitioners, vs. Edgar W. Ross as guardian of Mary M. Gray.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

704	Keystone Coal & Coke Co., vs. Petitioner, Michael Fitch, (substituted for Charles Young,) Administrator of the Estate of Josephine Fitch, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

705	Keystone Coal & Coke Co., vs. Petitioner, Frances Flury (substituted for Charles Young) as Administrator of the Estate of Tom Flury, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

706	Keystone Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner, vs. Anna Helmlinger, substituted for Charles Young, as Administrator of the Estate of Jacob Helmlinger, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

707	Keystone Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner, vs. Adam Miller.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] J. F. Stewart & Co., Inc., Petitioner, vs. N. W. Lippmann [illegible] Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

718 Elliott Varnish Co., Petitioner, vs. Sears, Roebuck & Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sun Company, Petitioner,
501. vs.
Vinton Petroleum Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James R. Smith,
F. C. Mills and
E. H. Moyer,
587 vs. Petitioners,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Thomas and Emanuel L. Bloom, as Executors of the last will and testament of S. W. Gray, deceased, Petitioners, vs. Caledonian Insurance Co. et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Stanley Lord, Master of the Steamship "Anglo-Patagonian," Petitioner, vs. William Lorimer, Peter Johnson, Edward Passey et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of or against the same, it is now here-

and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

709 Clarence Griggs and William W. Nash, individually and as Executors of the Estate of Solomon E. King deceased, Petitioners,
vs.
Hon. Page Morris, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

716 E. Clemens Horst Co. Petitioner
vs.
Pabst Brewing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as

Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.
10 vs Appellant,
The United States
The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co.
13 vs Appellant
The United States

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and the same are hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

The United States
88 vs Plaintiff in Error,
Henry C. [illegible]

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al.,
56 vs Appellants,
The United States

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section

Oregon & California
Railroad Co., et al.,
442 vs
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to bring up the whole record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd in behalf of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States.

Oregon & California
Railroad Co., et al.
442 vs
The United States.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, in behalf of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Fernand Vaughan Gasquet,
116 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George F. Lapeyre et al.
Fernand Vaughan Gasquet,
656 vs Appellant,
Charles Payne Fenner et al.

The motion to consolidate these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Thomas Gilmore, Mr. J. C. Gilmore, Mr. E. H. Pugh and Mr. William Winans Wall, of counsel for Fernand Vaughan Gasquet in support of the same, and Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy and Mr. Henry H. Chaffe, of counsel for the defendants in error and appellees in opposition thereto.

67 The Hart Steel Co. et al.
Petitioners,
vs.
The Railroad Supply Co.

95 The Railroad Supply Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

Mr. Taylor E. Brown, of counsel for the respondent in case No. 67 and for the petitioner in case No. 95, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass these cases.

76 Exploration Co., Ltd.,
et al.
Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

Mr. Colley W. Bell, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

228 The Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Farmers Trust & Savings Co., Administrator, &c.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by the Court that the writ of error in this cause costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

728 Ennis Brown Co., Petitioner, vs. Central Pacific Railway Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Burnett G. White in support of the same, and Mr. Charles H. Bates, Mr. W. H. Devlin and Mr. Robert T. Devlin in opposition thereto.

715 Motion Picture Patents Co., Petitioner, vs. Universal Film Manufacturing Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Melville Church in support of the same, and Mr. Edmund Wetmore and Mr. Oscar W. Jeffery in opposition thereto.

717 John W. Thompson, Petitioner, vs. The Franklin National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George H. Lamar and Mr. William E. Davis in support of the same, and Mr. John Ridout in opposition thereto.

155 John T. Bancroft,
et al. Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Grand Trunk Western Rail
way Co.

Mr. C. B. Ellis, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to place this cause on the summary docket.

11 Illinois Central Rail
road Co. et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
George R. Williams.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. M. F. Harrington and Mr. William H. Watkins in support of the same, and Mr. Charles C. Le Forgee, Mr. Blewett Lee and Mr. Charles N. Burch in opposition thereto.

78 William P. Cross,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank B. Crosthwaite and Mr. E. F. Colladay, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

27 The Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Lucien [illegible]

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

28 Right Reverend Libert Hubert Boeynaems, Bishop of Zeugma, etc., Trustee, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
L. Ah Leong

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Lorrin Andrews of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. David L. Withington, of counsel for the defendant in error.

8 James Dunn, Petitioner,
vs.
William Edenborn

9 Thomas P. Alder, Petitioner,
vs.
William Edenborn

These causes were argued by Mr. Theron G. Strong, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the respondent.

22 Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs.
W. F. Jacoby & Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Francis I. Gowen, of counsel for the Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned
until tomorrow

Tuesday, October 24th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Darlington it is ordered that Samuel [illegible], Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. E. Richardson, it is ordered that C. H. Moore, Esquire, of Monticello, and T. C. [illegible], Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn ac-

21 Franklin O. Bunting, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oregon

On consideration of the stipulation to submit this case on printed briefs, It is now here ordered by the Court that leave to submit the case be and the same is hereby denied, and that the case be passed temporarily, to be restored to the call for assignment after cases Nos. 23 and 26.

22 Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs.
W. F. Jacoby & Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., of counsel for W. F. Jacoby & Company, and concluded by Mr. John G. Johnson, of counsel for the Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

24 Paine Lumber Co., Ltd., et al., Appellants,
vs.
Elbridge N. Neal, individually and as secretary, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Charles Maitland Beattie, of counsel for the Labor Union appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, October 25th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. W. Bishop, it is ordered that Victor I. Minahan, Esquire, of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Gunter, it is ordered that Giles William Lawrence Smith, Esquire, of Brewton, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

1104
O.T. 1915

William L. Dayton, Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
vs
A. H. Stannard, Treasurer, etc., et al.

Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to recall the mandate and reform the decree of the Court in this cause.

48

Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner
vs
John Mitchell, individually, et al.

On motion of Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the petitioner, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed subject to the provisions of section 7, rule 26.

39

The Sanders Ice Cream Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs
The State of Iowa.

40

The Hutchinson Ice Cream Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs
The State of Iowa.

41

A. B. Crowl, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On motion of Mr. W. J. Crowl, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and they are hereby passed subject to the provisions of section 7, rule 26.

10. Southern Railway Company Carolina Division, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Francis D. Briggs et al.
13. Southern Railway Company Carolina Division, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Hubert Briggs by his guardian &c.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records, and printed arguments by Mr. B. L. Abney and Mr. John K. Graves, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Blanton & Merrifield, of counsel for the defendants in error.

24. Carrie Lumber Co., Ltd., et al., vs. Appellants, Elbridge H. Neal, individually and as secretary, etc., et al.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Frederick Huber, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Daniel Davenport, of counsel for the appellants.

5. Erie Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, James T. Welsh.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leroy A. Manchester, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William R. Stewart, of counsel for the defendant in error.

34 The Chicago, Terre Haute & Southeastern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Champion B. Anderson.

This cause was argued by Mr. William F. Peter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

36 Martin H. Fox, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, October 26th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Constant Southworth, it is ordered that Charles A. Greene, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Patrick H. Loughran, it is ordered that F. C. Heffron, Esquire, of Dickinson, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that Daniel L. McCarthy, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that Lindley M. Garrison, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

24 Paine Lumber Co., Ltd., et al., Appellants, vs. Elbridge H. Neal, individually and as secretary, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Daniel Davenport, of counsel for the appellants, leave is granted to file an additional memorandum in this cause.

47 William H. Berry et al., Appellants, vs. Rudolph Davis

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. George Cosson, of counsel for the appellants. No appearance is entered for the appellee.

36 Marion H. Kerr, Plaintiff in Error, vs The Western Union Telegraph Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin F. Eslinger of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Rush Taggart, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Benjamin F. Eslinger of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

37 The City of Cincinnati, Appellant, vs The Cincinnati & Hamilton Junction Co., et al.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Constant Southworth, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation having been made the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Edwin E. Huffman, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, it is ordered that James D. Feehan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

7
The United States,
Appellant and
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Nashville, Chatta-
nooga & St. Louis Railway.

Appeal from and in
error to the District
Court of the United
States for the Middle
District of Tennessee.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that this is the second term at which this cause has been called for argument, and that neither party is now prepared to argue the same, it is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed, pursuant to the 19th rule of this Court; Whereupon, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal and the writ of error in this cause be, and the same are hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

35
The City of Cincinnati,
Appellant,
vs.
The Cincinnati & Hamil-
ton Traction Co., et al.

The reargument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Constant Southworth of counsel for the appellant.

44
The City of Montgomery,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
R. H. Greene, et al.
45
The City of Montgomery,
vs. Plaintiff in Error

These cases were argued by Mr. William A. Gunter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was en-

44 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Emerson Hadley of counsel for the respondent.

28 Portuguese-American Bank of San Francisco, Appellant, vs. Paul F. Welles et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William R. Harr of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Harold Remington, of counsel for the appellees.

46. Minerals Separation, Ltd. et al. Petitioners, vs. James M. Hyde

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the petitioners, It is ordered by the Court that one hour additional be allowed each side in the argument of this cause. The argument was commenced by Mr. Henry D. Williams of counsel for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monda

Monday, October 16th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that A. Edmund Young, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. [illegible], it is ordered that John F. [illegible], Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Charles F. Greenwood, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Griggs, it is ordered that Herbert Boggs, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert A. Doub, it is ordered that F. Brooke Whiting and George Lewis Eppler, Esquires, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Edson, it is ordered that John T. Barker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Putnam, it is ordered that William Pender Smith, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Myer Cohen, it is ordered that Jesse S. Epstein, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Edmund Stearns Brush, Esquire, of Ridgefield, State of Connecticut, and George E. Maddox, Esquire, of Rome, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

58 Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George E. Ward.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

17 Mary Helen Brown, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of New York. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

28 Right Reverend Libert Hubert Boeynaems, Bishop of Zeugma, Vicar Apostolic of Hawaiian Islands, Plaintiff in Error, vs. L. Ah Leong. In Error to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Railway-
Carolina Division,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Fannie D. Briggs and her
husband, H. D. Briggs.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the
State of South
Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Railway-
Carolina Division,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Hubert Briggs by his
guardian ad litem, H. D.
Briggs.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of South
Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

38 Martin H. Free, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

41 The City of Montgomery, Plaintiff in Error, vs. R. H. Greene, W. C. Matthews, Jr., and C. H. Ragsdale. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of Montgomery, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. H. McDade, A. A. Hannah, A. L. Lichtenberg, et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

There having been an associate justice of this Court appointed since the adjournment of the last term, It is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the Circuits agreeably to the Act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, J. C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, William R. Day, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, John H. Clarke, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible]
October
Term, 1915

William L. Dayton,
Trustee, etc., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
A. H. Stewart, Treasurer, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate and reform the decree in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

67
The Hart Steel Co., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The Railroad Supply Co.

95
The Railroad Supply Co.
vs. Petitioner
Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

On consideration of the motion to pass these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

686
Exploration Co., Limited,
and Philip L. Foster,
vs. Appellants,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

899
John T. Bancroft,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Great Northern Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket

per

Illinois Central Railroad Co. and Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., et al.,
87. vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
George R. Williams

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Motion Picture Patents Co.,
vs. Petitioner
Universal Film Manufacturing Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

John W. Thompson,
vs. Petitioner
The Franklin National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the

said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

728	Ennis-Brown Co., vs. Petitioner, Central Pacific Railway Co. and Southern Pacific Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 232, 242, 420, 421, 375, 376, 148, 275, 338, 541, 600, 699, and 637 be, and they are hereby assigned for argument at the head of the call for Monday, November 14th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

575	Yee Suey vs. Petitioner. F. W. Berkshire, Supervising Inspector, &c.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the [illegible] motion of the Court on

Mr. Walter Davis in support of the same; and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

717
The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Achilles Kelly et al.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause to be heard with case No. 84, as one case, and that both cases be assigned for argument on Monday December 4th next.

721
Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States ex rel. Fowler Car Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren in support of the same, and Mr. Melville Church and Mr. C. C. Linthicum in opposition thereto.

729
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.
vs. Petitioner,
Wagner Electric Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Paul of the same, and Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Edwin C. Huffman in opposition thereto.

718 Edgar F. Luckenbach et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining Co. and the Insular Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Peter S. Carter and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham in support of the same, and Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. Mark W. Maclay, Jr., of counsel for the Insular Line, in opposition thereto.

611 Commercial Security Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Stewart N. Dunning, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry A. Heinz in support of the same, and Mr. Lucius F. Robinson in opposition thereto.

631 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
David Brannon.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this case or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the motion and printed arguments by Mr. A. A. [illegible], Mr. [illegible] the same, and Mr. George A. Pearre and Mr. Duncan U. Brant in opposition thereto.

743 L. A. Westermann Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Dispatch Printing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Curtis C. Williams in support of the same.

497 Nathan H. Hughes et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, Mr. Theodore Mack and Mr. John Wingfield Pope in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

558 Ben Frankfurt,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James M. Edmunds in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren in opposition thereto.

Monday, October 30th, 1916, continued.

598.
William R. Staats Co. et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Security Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. O'Melveny in support of the same.

567.
Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Wilfred L. Gifford.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Original.
State of Minnesota, Complainant,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

Mr. Charles R. Pierce, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

603.
Henry F. Marshall, Petitioner,
vs.
Samuel W. Rankin

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the

counsel by Mr. Henry [illegible] in support of the same.

383 The John Church Co., Petitioner, vs. Hilliard Hotel Co. et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Moses H. Grossman of counsel for the petitioner in support of the same, and Mr. [illegible] of counsel for the respondents in opposition thereto.

62. The Restoration Society et al., Appellants, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. D. B. Henderson, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass this case.

568 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Bertha L. Thompson, as Administratrix, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Humphrey Barton in support of the same, and Mr. William H. Bremner and Mr. Frederick M. Miner in opposition thereto.

Minerals Separation,
Ltd., et al.,
416 vs. Petitioners,
James M. Hyde.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry D. Williams, of counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Walter A. Scott, of counsel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, October 31st, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

547 Rome Railway & Light Co., Appellant, vs. Floyd County, Georgia, et al.

Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

46 Minerals Separation, Limited, et al., Petitioners, vs. James M. Hyde.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. William Houston Kenyon, of counsel for the petitioners.

49 Long Sault Development Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Homer D. Call, (as successor of John J. Kennedy, as treasurer of the State of New York.)

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry W. Taft, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Merton E. Lewis, of counsel for the defendant in error.

51 Frank J. Kane, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of New Jersey.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John W. Griggs, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Herbert Boggs, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. Charles Gladstone Tenny, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until

Wednesday, November 1st, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Lloyd Milton, Esquire, of Chickasha, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Mary E. Sweeney and Katharine R. Pike, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court and they were sworn accordingly

Wednesday, November 1st, 1916, continued.

46

Minerals Separation,
Limited, et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
James M. Hyde.

It is ordered by the Court that counsel for the respondent be allowed one hour additional argument in this case; one half hour allowed each side.

72

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of North Carolina.

On motion of Mr. Murray Allen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.
* See p 155

54

Susie A. Tyrrell, as
Administratrix, &c.,
vs. Petitioner
The District of Columbia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Leon H. Dorsid, of counsel for the petitioner; continued by Mr. Percival H. Marshall and Mr. Conrad H. Syme, of counsel for the respondent; and concluded by Mr. Alexander Wolf, of counsel for the petitioner.

46.

Minerals Separation,
Limited, et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
James M. Hyde.

The additional argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry D. Williams, of counsel for the petitioners; continued by Mr. Walter A. Scott, of counsel for the of counsel for the petitioners.

59 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The City of Raleigh, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Murray Allen, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. John W. Hinsdale, Jr., of counsel for the appellee.

60 Goshen Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, vs. Hubert A. Myers Manufacturing Co., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Fred L. Chappell, of counsel for the petitioner.

330 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Nathan Parker, as Administrator, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Benjamin D. Warfield, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Edmund C. O'Rear, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Thursday, November 2d, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Coleman, it is ordered that Hubert Falkner Miller, Esquire, of Bennington, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred O. Blue, it is ordered that John Clarence Pifer, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

110 Olof Lee, Master, &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
San Francisco & Portland
Steamship Co., Claimant, &c.

On motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of counsel for the respondent, leave is hereby granted to withdraw temporarily the original exhibits in this cause.

60 Grinnell Manufacturing
Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Hubert A. Myers Manufacturing Co., et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Fred L. Chappell, of counsel for the petitioner, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. F. N. Lockwood, of counsel for the respondents.

61 Harry F. Hill, a minor,
et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Frank Reynolds, a minor, &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alger Melton, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. F. E. Riddle, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

62 The [illegible] Society et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary

On consideration of the motion to pass this cause dered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

63 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James F. Rowell et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Henry E. Asp, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is

Friday, November 3d, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

(Present)

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that La Fayette Twitchell and Fred R. Wright, Esquires, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

79 Seton Hall College, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Village of South Orange, N.J., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to stipulation of counsel, on the record

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
63 vs.
James F. Rowell et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry E. Clap, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
64 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. B. Enslow, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. E. B. Hiss and Mr. F. C. Pifer, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
66 vs.
Ohio Valley Tie Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Helm Bruce, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Edward W. Hines, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next

Monday, November 6th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Mathews, it is ordered that George R. Creighton, George W. Bristol and Frederick P. King, Esquires, of New York City, and Arthur M. Allen, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

State of Minnesota,
Original, vs. Complainant.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first Monday of March next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

718 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Schuyler Kelly, Horace B. Kelly, Jr., Lillian Kelly Crawford, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 84 as one case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases are assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

433 The John Church Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
Hilliard Hotel Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

547 Rome Railway & Light Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Floyd County, Georgia, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

458 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
David Brennan

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

768 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Bertha L. Thompson, as Administratrix of the Estate of Charles E. Thompson, deceased.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

992 Oregon & California Railroad Co., et al.,
vs.
The United States

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up this case in its entirety, and that the transcript of record in case of Oregon & California Railroad Company et al. v. The United States, No. 679, October Term, 1914, be taken as a return to the writ, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

992 Oregon & California Railroad Co., et al.
vs.
The United States

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

603	Henry F. Marshall, Petitioner vs Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

721	Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, Petitioner vs. The United States ex rel. The Fowler Car Co.	On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, as well in support of as against the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

L. A. Westermann Co., Petitioner, vs. The Dispatch Printing Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

2.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edgar F. Luckenbach et al., Petitioners, vs. W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining Co. and The Insurance Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

3

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

375
Yee Suey,
vs. Petitioner
F. W. Berkshire, Supervising Inspector of Immigration at El Paso, Tex.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

533
Ben Frankfurt,
vs. Petitioner
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

William R. Staats Co. and Title Insurance and Trust Co. vs. Petitioners, Security Trust and Savings Bank, as Trustee in Bank- ruptcy of Fielding J. Stilson Co., Bankrupt.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commercial Security Co. and J. H. Steele, Trustee, vs. Petitioners, Edward M. Dunning, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Bowker Piano Co. Bankrupt.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the

677

Nathan A. Hughes,
and T. W. Hughes,
and A. F. Bourque,
vs. Petitioners
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

709

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Wagner Electric Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Republic of Cuba,
Original No. 21 Plaintiff,
vs. The State of North Carolina.

Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Marcus H. Burnstine, of counsel for the plaintiff submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file declaration and for issuance of summons in this cause.

48 Helena McGowney Hill, Petitioner,
vs.
Samuel Madden et al., as substituted trustee, &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. D. H. Burke, Mr. R. J. Dickey and Mr. Martin Conboy in support of the same, and Mr. A. S. Worthington and Mr. J. Russell Easby in opposition thereto.

25 C. W. Steele et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Highland Park Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John A. Marion and Mr. Joseph A. McCullough in support of the same, and Mr. Charles W. Tillett and Mr. E. T. Cansler in opposition thereto.

Clara S. Bell,
477 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Alfred W. F. Meyer

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arthur J. McDonald,
as Executor et al.,
80 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
J. T. McDonald et al

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record. It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by the Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Vandalia Railroad Co.,
81 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Public Service Commission of Indiana, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed

Samuel C. Weston and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. [illegible] Walters, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Ohio Valley Tie Co.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward W. Hines and Mr. John Bryce Baskin, of counsel for

6

the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Helm Bruce, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Dan O'Neil, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Northern Colorado Irrigation Co., et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Fred R. Wright, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. La Fayette Twitchell, of

5

counsel for the defendants in error.

Claude M. Dean, vs. Appellant, R. Bache Davis, Jr., trustee, etc., et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced, by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredith, of counsel, for the appellant.

7

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, November 7th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Ramsey, it is ordered that David J. Wolhaupter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. Ellis, it is ordered that James J. Sweeney, Esquire, of Owensboro, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

75 Francis J. Torrance, Trustee, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
First-Second National Bank of Pittsburgh.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.

76 Claude M. Dunn,
Appellant,
vs.
R. Beale Dunn, Jr., Trustee, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredith, of counsel, for the appellant, and the cause was submitted on printed argument by Mr. Richard B. Davis and Mr. Bartlett Roper, of counsel for the appellees.

77 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Henry H. C. Whitacre.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Duncan K. Brent, of counsel, for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Frank A. Furlow and Mr. Albert A. Doub, of counsel, for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. George A. Pearre, of counsel, for the plaintiff in error.

77 Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Robert A. Peery.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blewett Lee, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. G. B. Craighill, it is ordered that [illegible] R. Cunningham, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that William G. Rowe, Esquire, of [illegible], State of [illegible], be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the

by Mr. John B. Peterson, it is ordered that John H. Gavit, Esquire, of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Gillett, it is ordered that Frank B. Pattee, Esquire, of Crown Point, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

78 Central Trust Co. of New York, as Trustee, &c.,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

77 Illinois Central Railroad Co.
vs.
[illegible] Emma, Robert H. Peery.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Blewett Lee, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and the same was submitted on printed argument by Mr.

79	City of Owensboro, Kentucky vs. Appellant, Owensboro Water Works Co of Owensboro, Ky.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George W. Jolly of counsel for the appellant; continued by Mr. William T. Ellis of counsel for the ap-

pellee and concluded by Mr. Wm. D. Young of counsel for the appellant.

75	The James Clark Distilling Co., vs. Appellant, The Western Maryland Railway Co., et al.	The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. W. B. Wheeler and Mr. Fred. O. Blue of counsel for the appellee, the State of West Virginia and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell of counsel for the ap-
76	The James Clark Distilling Co., vs. Appellant, The American Express Co. et al.	

pellant.

Adjournment being moved, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, November 9th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna	
Oliver Wendell Holmes	
William R. Day	
Willis Van Devanter	Associate
Mahlon Pitney	Justices
James C. McReynolds	
Louis D. Brandeis	
John H. Clarke.	

Frank Key Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Quarles, it is ordered that Roscoe Walsworth, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Bristol, it is ordered that Nelson L. Keach, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

85.
Harriet H. Gould et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Hyde Park Water Co.
et al.

On motion of Mr.
Roscoe Hulmeister
of counsel for the ap-
pellants, It is ordered
by the Court that this
cause be, and the same is hereby passed temporarily and
an alias citation granted.

83
Francis J. Torrance,
Trustee of the Estate of
W. H. Graham, Bank-
rupt, et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
First Second National
Bank of Pittsburgh.

In Error to the District
Court of the United
States for the Western
District of Pennsylvania.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible]

75
The James Clark Distil-
ling Co.
vs. Appellant,
The Western Maryland
Railway Co. et al.
76
The James Clark Distilling Co.
vs. Appellant,
The A

The argument of these
causes was commenced by
Mr. Lawrence Maxwell,
of counsel for the appel-
lant.

Thursday November 9th 1916 continued.

52 Illinois Surety Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Frank Miller et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick C. King and Mr. George W. Bristol, of counsel for the appellees, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. L. Laflin Kellogg and Mr. Nelson L. Keach, of counsel for the appellant.

83 Francis J. Torrance,
Guardian, etc., et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
First-Second National
Bank of Pittsburgh.

On motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandate in this cause.

86 Vandalia Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Nathaniel C. Stinger.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles W. Moores, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear counsel for the defendant in error.

87 Lake Shore & Michigan
Southern Railway Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Susan Clough et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John B. Celeson, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. John H. Gillett and Mr. Frank B. Pettit, of counsel for the defendants in error, and Mr. J. W. Clark, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Friday, November 10th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. A. R. Thompson, it is ordered that Otto Schoenrich, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Caruthers Ewing, it is ordered that John P. Bullington, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice, as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission, 500 vs. Appellants The Pennsylvania Rail road Co. The United States et al. 501 vs. Appellants, The Pennsylvania Rail road Co.	On motion of Mr. C. W. Streeter in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in these cases for the Sterling Salt Company as amicus curiae.

O. P. Dabney et al.,
96 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
City Land Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

O. P. Dabney et al.,
97 vs. Plaintiffs in Error
John H. Whitelaw et al. as Executors &c.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause having been called for hearing in its reguparties have failed to print the transcript of the record. It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

87 Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Susan Clough et al. — The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. G. A. Frank, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

88 John C. McIntyre, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frederick W. Kavanaugh. — This cause was argued by Mr. Robert H. Patton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Myer Auerbach, of counsel for the defendant in error.

89 W. A. Cissna, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Tennessee. — This cause was argued by Mr. Cornelius Ewing, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John T. Lellyett, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, November 13th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel A. Clark, it is ordered that William H. Fry, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Spencer, it is ordered that Augustus Benners, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

half by Mr. Robert M. Montgomery, it is ordered that William M. Smith, Esquire, of St. Johns, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William [illegible] Hargest, it is ordered that Americus H. Woodward, Esquire, of Clearfield, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, it is ordered that Jesse Van Valkenburg, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that George J. Hogg, Esquire, of New York City, and Antonio Aponte, Jr., Esquire, of [illegible], Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], it is ordered that R. L. [illegible], Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted ered and so was entered accordingly.

Portuguese-American Bank of San Francisco, Appellant,
vs.
Paul F. Welles, John Daniel, Trustee of Metropolis Construction Co., Bankrupt, and Thomas F. Boyd.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
[illegible] Stewart, as Administrator [illegible]
[illegible]

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

78 William P. Cross, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, nunc pro tunc, as of October 23d, 1916.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

82 Illinois Surety Co., Appellant,
vs.
Frank Miller, Arthur M. Hazel, Augustus Wenacoutte, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On

It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution, with five per cent damages.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

76 Vandalia Railroad Co., vs. Hamiffen Brock & Nathaniel C. Strange. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution, with five per cent. damages.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Original Republic of Cuba, Plaintiff, vs. State of North Carolina. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a declaration in this cause; It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, and that notice of this order be given to the Governor of North Carolina and the Attorney General of the United States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

739	E. G. Steele, Mary E. Steele, Orrietta Steele, et al., Petitioners, vs. Highland Park Manufacturing Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

740	Heloise McCeney Hills, Petitioner, vs. Samuel Maddox and Arthur T. Brice, as substituted Trustees under the last will and testament of Harriet McCeney, deceased, etc., et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

77 George Edwards, vs. Zenith Steamship Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument on Monday, January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day. It is further ordered by the Court that a writ of certiorari issue to bring up the entire record in this case.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

13 Mountain Timber Co., vs. (Plaintiff in Error), The State of Washington.

[illegible] J. E. Hawkins, vs. (Appellant), Edward L. Bleakly, Auditor, et al.

80 Southern Pacific Co. vs. (Plaintiff in Error), Marie Jensen.

81 Clyde Steamship Co., vs. (Plaintiff in Error), William Alfred Walker.

50 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. vs. (Plaintiff in Error), Hannah White.

51 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. vs. (Plaintiff in Error), James Winfield.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Co.,
358 vs Plaintiff in Error,
Amy L. Winfield

Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.
18 vs Appellants,
The United States.

The United States,
19 vs Appellant,
Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.

William A. Hancock
758 vs Plaintiff in Error,
Alexander R. Mullowny,
Judge of the Police Court of
the District of Columbia

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 20th instant, to Monday, December 4th, next.

International Harvester
Co. of New Jersey et al.,
56 vs Appellants,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to assign the cause for argument, with a suggestion that such an argument be made for Monday, December 4th, next. Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft and Mr. John P. Wilson, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a suggestion that the cause be assigned for Monday, February 26th next.

[illegible] E. B. Pickel & Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Cobb and Mr. Albert H. Washburn in support of the same.

[illegible]38 Alex. D. Shaw & Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Cobb and Mr. Albert H. Washburn in support of the same.

[illegible] Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Petitioner, vs. Isaac M. Bump. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph P. Nolan and Mr. John M. Nolan in support of the same, and Mr. Frederic C. Wygant in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Lum Hong Yen, Petitioner, vs. Henry Frost, United States Immigrant Inspector, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. J. Henning in support of the same.

679 Werner Horn,
vs. Appellant,
John G. Mitchell,
United States Marshal, &c.

Mr. Joseph F. O'Connell, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

No. 776 F. Vitelli & Son,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert M. Yuzzolino in support of the same.

781 Chautauqua Institution,
vs. Petitioner,
John L. Zimmerman, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thornton M. Hinkle in support of the same, and Mr. J. Warren Keifer in opposition thereto.

178 Frank Taylor et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Drainage District No. 56
of Emmet County, Iowa, et al.

Mr. Hugh H. Obear on behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, suggested the death of Frank Taylor, one of the plaintiffs in error in this cause, and moved the Court to make Emma Taylor, Administratrix of the said Frank Taylor, deceased, a party plaintiff in error herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Emma Taylor as Administratrix of Frank Taylor, deceased he and she is hereby made a party plaintiff in error in this cause.

James W. Campbell,
vs. Petitioner,
Charles W. Campbell
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Henry White in support of the same and Mr. John Roland in opposition thereto.

Carl F. Ahlmann,
vs. Petitioner,
David C. Gibboney

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Perry B. Mills of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. James A. Bowie of counsel for the respondent.

Martin E. Donohue,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Benjamin Cooper et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Dan H. Ball in support of the same, and Mr. A. H. Ryall in opposition thereto.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John M. Roach

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the

Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Merritt J. Gordon in support of the same and Mr. [illegible] H. Field in opposition thereto.

49.
The Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The First National Bank of Ottawa, Ohio.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edward P. Moulinier in support of the same and Mr. Landon L. Fechheimer and Mr. Ferdinand Jelke, Jr., in opposition thereto.

91.
Wells Fargo & Co. Express,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Oklahoma.

92.
The American Express Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Oklahoma.

93.
United States Express Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Oklahoma.

It is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and they are hereby, passed for settlement.

94.
Kansas City Stock Yards Co. of Missouri,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
State of Kansas ex rel. John S. Dawson, Attorney General.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued for stipulation of counsel.

Norwich Buchard & Winchen, Petitioners, vs. Lehman, H. Co. et al. 57 Max Jaffe et al., surviving members, etc., vs. Appellants, William C. Lovell, as receiver, etc., et al. 58 Max Jaffe et al., surviving members, etc., vs. Appellants, Hermann C. A. Westphalen et al.	These causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and brief already on file, and, on motion of Mr. W. W. Spencer, of counsel for the appellees, his brief to be filed on or before Monday next.

[illegible] Martin Hansen, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Great Northern Railway Co. — This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Rowe, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on printed brief by Mr. C. C. Lumbly and Mr. A. L. Jones, of counsel for the defendant in error.

[illegible] The Lancashire Fire Insurance Co. et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The State of Iowa. [illegible] The Netherlands Fire Insurance Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Iowa.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Walter Jeffreys Carlin, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. H. L. Parrish, of counsel

58 A. B. Ward,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Error in cases Nos. 39 and 40, Mr. William M. Hargest, of counsel for the defendant in error in case No. 58, and Mr. George Cassen, of counsel for the defendant in error in cases Nos. 39 and 40, and concluded by Mr. Walter Jeffreys Carlin, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

464 L. T. Hays,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.
139 F. Drew Caminetti,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.
163 Maury I. Diggs,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Henry C. Clausen, of counsel for the petitioner in case No. 464, and continued by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the petitioners in cases Nos. 139 and 163, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the respondent.

*99 Henry N. Kryger,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John S. Wilson et al. Admins, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. O. E. Holman and Mr. William H. Fay, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. George S. Grimes and Mr. Jesse Van Valkenburg, of counsel for the defendants in error.

[illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, it is ordered that Abraham J. Whitaker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Jesse L. Wiley, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

102 Hiram Chase, Appellant, vs. Ella Hanson. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and the appellant having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his appeal, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. C. J. Kappler, of counsel for the appellee, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Western Transit Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. C. Leslie Co., Ltd. On motion of Mr. C. J. Tillinghast, in behalf of counsel, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

[illegible] Furness, Withy & Co., Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Yang-Tsze Insurance Association, Limited, et al. On motion of Mr. F. S. Hinckley in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed

18 American Bonding Co.
of Baltimore
 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America
to the use of [illegible]
et al.

In Error to the
United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

164 L. T. Hays,
 vs. Petitioner,
The United States
139 F. Drew Caminetti,
 vs. Petitioner,
The United States
163 Maury I. Diggs,
 vs. Petitioner,
The United States

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the respondent, and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the petitioners in cases Nos. 139 and 163, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the respondent.

[illegible] The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.
 vs. Plaintiff in Error

This cause was argued by Mr. F. B. Enslow, of counsel for the plain argument for the defendant in error.

107 Swift & Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants, vs. J. Noble Hoover, alleged Bankrupt.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. A. Birney, Mr. N. Winship Wheatley and Mr. L. J. Loving of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and appellants, and Mr. C. F. Colladay of counsel for the defendant in error and appellee.

108 Dan S. Lehon, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Atlanta.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, Mr. Marion Smith and Mr. Max F. Goldstein of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Samuel D. Hewlett, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, November 15th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Tow it is ordered that Walter E. Bliss, Esquire, of Greeley, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co.,
Appellant,
vs
Thomas W. Rowe, individually, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and

No. 43.

110 Olaf Lie, Master, &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
San Francisco & Portland
Steamship Co., Claimant, &c.

On motion of Mr. [illegible] of counsel for the petitioner, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

111 The Manufacturers' Light
& Heat Co. et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Lee Ott, et al., Public Service Commission, &c.

On motion of Mr. C. F. Wilson of counsel for the appellants, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

112. Jesse L. Hannage, et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Annie M. Mastin et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

113 William Briggs,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Kansas

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed record with leave to counsel to file briefs for both sides within fifteen days.

Grace W. Weston, widow and individually and as Administratrix, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Butler Brothers & Co. et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

George W. Stewart,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles H. Ramsey.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert C. Fergus, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed brief by Mr. Clarence S. Darrow, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Great Northern Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Capital Trust Co., as Administrator.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. L. Janes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Samuel A. Anderson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Union Pacific Railroad Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld, State of Colorado, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. C. Dorsey, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles F. Tew, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred E. Ommen, it is ordered that Leonard J. Obermeier, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert S. Marley, it is ordered that Alfred Newton Gossett, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made

Mr. E. Q. Keasbey, it is ordered that Thomas N. McCarter, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Hamilton, it is ordered that Emmet V. Puryear, Esquire, of Danville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Clayton Carpenter, it is ordered that Arnold Clemens Otto, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

[illegible]

Motion Picture Patents Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Universal Film Manufacturing Co. et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Melville D. Church, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, in support of the same, and by Mr. Oscar W. Jeffery, of counsel for the respondents, in opposition thereto.

120 Charles Schweinler Press,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of New York.

On motion of Mr. L. B. Wehle leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause in behalf of the National Consumers League as amicus curiae on or before December 4th next.

133 Benito Lovato,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Mexico.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Frank W. Clancy, of counsel for the defendant in error, and leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a brief within twenty days.

134 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

111 Atlantic City Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Lewis S. H. Parker.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas E. French, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. David O. Watkins, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Germania Insurance Company,
116 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George F. Hoffman et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Warren Hall, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. George Bunge, Mr. Victor Leovy and Mr. Henry H. Chaffe, of counsel for the defendants in error.

New York Central &
Hudson River Railroad Co.
118 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Eliza Fraloff.

This cause was argued by Mr. Albert L. Marley of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Justin D. Bowersock of counsel for the defendant in error.

Charles Lohmanke Pease,
126 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Alfred E. Ommen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

John Armstrong Chalmers,
127 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas T. Chamman.

Leave is hereby granted Mr. E. F. Bulladay to file an additional brief in this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. F. Bulladay, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., of counsel for the defendant in error.

mmons at 12 o'clock

Friday, November 17th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Louis Greenberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, it is ordered that William H. England, Esquire, of Ponca City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.

Warren Olney Jr., Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Richard Warren Barrett, Esquire, of New York City, and Henry J. Burch, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde G. Aitchison, it is ordered that Scott Z. Henderson, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

238 Christopher L. Williams, as Receiver etc., Appellant, vs. John C. Gott.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John R. Lambson and Mr. Chauncey E. Blake, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Samuel R. Babbitt, of counsel for the appellee.

121 John Armstrong Chaloner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas T. Sherman. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Joseph H. Choate Jr., of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Sidney J. Dudley, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until

Monday, November 20th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Stone, it is ordered that William F. Smith, Esquire, of Butler, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Clifton, it is ordered that Francis H. [illegible], Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Coombe, it is ordered that G. T. Morgan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Peter Keating, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dan O'Neil, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Northern Colorado Irrigation Co., et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

68

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The City of Raleigh and James I. Johnson, O. G. King and R. B. Seawell, Commissioners of the City of Raleigh. — 59

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. — 16

On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the reargument of this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for reargument at the head of the call for Monday, February 26th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

679 Werner Horn, Appellant,
vs.
John J. Mitchell, United States Marshal for the District of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

374 Jesse Fuller Stevens et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Victor Talking Machine Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

755 Motion Picture Patents Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Universal Film Manufacturing Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

585 Martin E. Donahue,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Benjamin Cooper, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] The Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The First National Bank of Warren, Ohio.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] G. S. Nicholas & Co. et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Alexander D. Shaw & Co., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

tiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

769	F. Vitelli & Son, Petitioners, vs. The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

770	F. Vitelli & Son, Petitioners, vs. The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Lem Hong Yun, Petitioner, vs. Clinton Frost, U.S. Immigration Inspector &c. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Chautauqua Institution, Petitioner, vs. John L. Zimmerman et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

763 James W. Campbell, Petitioner, vs. Charles M. Campbell and Pauline Campbell. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

773 Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Petitioner, vs. Jesse M. Dempsey. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] In the matter of Edmund B. Kellogg et al. &c. Petitioners
[illegible] Original

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Thomas A. E. Weadock and Mr. Harrison Geer, of counsel for the respondent.

[illegible] William Dixon et al., Appellants, vs. George W. [illegible] et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and Mr. Benjamin L. [illegible] in opposition thereto.

[illegible] The United States, Appellant, vs. [illegible] et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal: Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

9, Original. The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion of Mr. C. Edward Wright of counsel for the defendant, leave is hereby granted to file the report of the commissioner and to open and publish the testimony in this cause.

656 Hans Berg, Prize Master, &c., et al., Appellants, vs. British & African Steam Navigation Co.

Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury of counsel for the appellee, and submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

[illegible] Original New York Electric Lines Co., Petitioner, vs. William J. Gaynor et al., &c.

Mr. Alexander S. Bacon, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a petition for a writ of error in this cause. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that notice be served on opposing counsel, together with a copy of the petition and brief, if any, within five days, and that the matter be finally submitted to the Court within fifteen days on the papers both parties desire to file.

538 Paul Schaumberg,
vs. Petitioner,
The Baltic Steamship Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Ralston and Mr. William E. Richardson in support of the same.

579 George W. Caldwell, and John Drake, as Caldwell & Drake, et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Northwestern Iron Culv. Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. H. Ralston and Mr. William E. Richardson in support of the same, and Mr. Edgar H. Scott in opposition thereto.

595 Great Northern Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Anna Knapp, as Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thos. Davis and Mr. Ernest W. Michel in support of the same, and Mr. E. C. Lindley and Mr. A. L. Jones in opposition thereto.

747 Paul Appenzellar, vs. [illegible], Exec., Henry C. Conrad, Associate Judge, etc., et al.

Mr. J. J. Darlington and Mr. Robert H. Richards of counsel for the defendants in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

585 Watts, Watts & Co., Ltd., Petitioner. vs. Unione Austriaca di Navigazione, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. John M. Woolsey of counsel for the petitioner in support of the same, and Mr. Charles S. Haight, of counsel for the respondent in opposition thereto.

761 The Victor-American Fuel Co., Petitioner vs. Paul Tomljanovich, per pro. ami.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Caldwell Yeaman in support of the same, and Mr. Geo. [illegible] in opposition thereto.

22 Memphis Street Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. J. W. Bole, Administratrix &c.	Mr. John K. Evans in behalf of counsel for the respondents, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to place
23 Memphis Street Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. L. C. Moore, Administrator &c.	

these cases on the summary docket.

Wells Fargo & Company Express, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The American Express Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

93. United States Express Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed: Therefore, on consideration of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, December 4th, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, December 11th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. M. Vale, it is ordered that James M. E. O'Grady, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Shannon Nelson, it is ordered, that John H. Clifton, Esquire, of Sumter, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby it is ordered that Herbert L. Davis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. W. Millan, it is ordered that Marcellus L. Countryman, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Hagerman, it is ordered that Arthur Miller, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Charles B. Britain, Esquire, of Waco, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that James M. Sheean, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] R. [illegible], it is ordered that Herbert [illegible], Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick [illegible] Tyler, it is ordered that Henry [illegible] Robinson, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah; George T. Cunningham and Harry W. Standidge, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Guy [illegible], Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rowland R. McMahon, it is ordered that James A. Sheppard, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], it is ordered that Henry F. McCrenna, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

D. Clark, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilbur E. Reed, it is ordered that Thomas M. Morrow, Esquire, of Scottsbluff and Joseph G. Beeler, Esquire, of North Platte, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt, it is ordered that William F. Tammany, Esquire, of South Norwalk, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Kenney it is ordered that John D. Ellis, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that Douglas McKay, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States vs. Petitioner Northern Pacific Railway Co.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. et al. Appellants, vs Merchants & Manufacturers Traffic Association of Sacramento, et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Hutchinson Ice Cream Co. and C. J. Hutchinson, Manager, 40 vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The State of Iowa.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Sanitary Ice Cream Co. et al. 39 vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The State of Iowa.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

56 A. B. Conrad,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

57 Frank J. Kane,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Jersey.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

77	The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error vs. Harvey W. C. Whitacre	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

99	Henry H. Kryger, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ida E. Wilson and J. E. Davis, Administrators of the Estate of Edward H. Wilson, deceased	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

5 James Guy, Petitioner, vs. William Robinson. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

2 Thomas F. Hale, Petitioner, vs. William Robinson. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

88 John C. McIntyre, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Frederick W. Kavanaugh.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
L. C. McLaughlin.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Pocahontas County, State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Pocahontas County, State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Great Northern Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Capital Trust Co., as Administrator of the Estate of William M. Reed, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause

Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

118 New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mary Esther Beaham.

In Error to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney.

105 George W. Stewart, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles H. Ramsay.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United

was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sonman Shaft Coal Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. W. F. Jacoby & Co.	On certificate from and writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to grant a new trial.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney.

74.
Seton Hall College,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Village of South Orange,
in Essex County, New
Jersey, and Board of Equalization of Taxes of New Jersey.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

[illegible] & Co., [illegible] & Co., [illegible] and [illegible] & Co., Appeal from and In Error to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

101 Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,

vs.

J. [illegible] [illegible], Assignee [illegible] Bankrupt.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal and the writ of error in this cause be, and the same are hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Davis.

[illegible] Memphis & [illegible] Railroad Co., In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

[illegible] Plaintiff in Error

vs.

James F. [illegible]

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Davis.

Monday, December 4th, 1916.

290	Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al., Appellants, vs. United States of America et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions that the injunction issue without prejudice to further orders by the Interstate Commerce Commission as stated in the opinion.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke

412	The United States, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. Hermann H. Oppenheimer et al.	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

111 Atlantic City Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louis B. M. Parker. In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

[illegible] Dow S. Lebsen, Plaintiff in Error, vs. [illegible] of Atlanta. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

11, Original

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed be, and the same is hereby granted. It is further ordered that the issuing of such writ be stayed until the end of the present term of this Court, unless The United States otherwise requests, when it will issue as a matter of course.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

147.

William H. Berry et al., Appellants,
vs.
Rudolph Davis

Attention is directed to the fact that the statute of Iowa of April 19, 1913 (Supplement to Iowa Code, 1913, p. 1152) concerning which the appellee complained and the enforcement of which by the Board of Parole he sought by his suit to enjoin, has been repealed during the pendency of the case in this Court (Ch. 187 of 1915, Supplemental Supplement to Iowa Code, 1915, p. 1008) the use of the first provision [illegible] printed brief to point out the reasons, if any, which exist why the appeal in this case should not be dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

96 Martin Johnson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Great Northern Railway Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

113 William Briggs,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

27

Gideon Dixon, Walter Smith, William Simmons et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
George W. Goethals, Chester Harding, H. D. Mitchell and Panama Railroad Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

474

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.
vs.
Plaintiff in Error
John M. Welch.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error

for the want of jurisdiction.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

622	Memphis Street Railway Co. vs. Petitioner E. W. Cook, Administrator, &c.	It is ordered by the Court that these causes be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
623	Memphis Street Railway Co. vs. Petitioner L. C. Moore, Administrator, &c.	
690	Great Northern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Anna Donaldson, as Administratrix, etc.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
719	Watts, Watts & Co., Ltd. vs. Petitioner, Unione Austriaca Di Navigazione, etc.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court

that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

727	[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error [illegible]	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It-

by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

650 Hans Berg, Prize Master in charge of the prize ship "Appam" et al., Appellants,
vs.
British & African Steam Navigation Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance the cause, &c., it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

524 Paul Schaumburg, Petitioner,
vs.
The Dollar Steamship Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George W. Caldwell and Lottie Deans, co-partners, trading as Caldwell & Deans, and Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
775 vs. Petitioners,	
Northwestern Iowa Cotton Company.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Boston-American Fruit Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.
61 vs. Petitioner,	
Paul Tomljanovich, per pro ami.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of or against the same, it is now here and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

138 The United States, vs. Appellant, American-Asiatic Steamship Co., et al. Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reverse the decree of the District Court herein and to remand the cause with instructions to dismiss the petition without prejudice.

169 The United States vs. Appellant, Prince Line, Limited, et al. Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reverse the decree of the District Court herein and to remand the cause with instructions to dismiss the petition without prejudice.

[illegible] The United States et al., vs. Appellants, Illinois Central Railroad Co. Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

[illegible] ✓ The United States, vs. Appellant, E. R. Upon motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, [illegible] leave is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

175 William M. Ward, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Insurance Company of North America.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

186 Eighteen Packages of Dental Instruments, Samuel Weber, Claimant, Appellant and Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error and appellee, in support of the same, and Mr. John A. Keats, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, in opposition thereto.

288 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jesse L. Woodward.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

697 The United States, vs. Henry S. Walker et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

764 First National Bank of Bay City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Grant Fellows, Attorney General of the State of Michigan ex rel. Union Trust Co. et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, on behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

764 First National Bank of Bay City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Grant Fellows, Attorney General of the State of Michigan ex rel. Union Trust Co. et al.

Leave is hereby granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

790 S. A. Hays, Collector of Internal Revenue, &c., Petitioner, vs. The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

797 Francis M. Wilson, United States Attorney, &c., Appellant, vs. Alexander New and Henry C. Ferris, as Receivers, etc.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case.

727 Victor [illegible] et al., Petitioners, vs. The [illegible] Co.

Mr. John W. Davis, in behalf of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case to be heard with case No. 488 as one case on January 8th next. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

105 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William C. Hagen.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this case or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Rufus S. Day and Mr. F. S. Bennett in support of the same, and Mr. Alfred H. [illegible], Mr. Edward Kibler and Mr. George W. Hamilton in opposition thereto.

340 + 341 The United States et al., Appellants, vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The motion for leave to file a brief in this cause on behalf of the Union Transit Line Company as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Douglas Campbell in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

669 National Bank of Commerce of Rochester, Petitioner, vs. Wilbur B. Grandison as Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James M. E. O'Grady and Mr. Eugene Van Voorhis in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas E. Brooks in opposition thereto.

289 The State of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Desert Water, Oil & Irrigation Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles F. Conrad and Mr. A. H. Ricketts in support of the same and Mr. U. S. Webb in opposition thereto.

783

Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Appellant,
vs.
The United States et al.

Mr. Edgar H. Boles, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

773

L. Brown and his wife Annie Brown, Petitioners,
vs.
J. R. Chapman et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William D. Gordon in support of the same, and Mr. J. W. Terry and Mr. H. M. [illegible] in opposition thereto.

Original

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Mississippi.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the defendant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a petition requesting a certificate as to a certain map desired to be introduced in evidence by the defendant.

Original

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to open and publish the testimony in this cause.

584. The Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Gold Issue Mining & Milling Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. P. H. Cullen, Mr. Thomas T. Fauntleroy and Mr. Charles M. Hay in support of the same, and Mr. Fred. Herrington in opposition thereto.

704. Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William J. McWhirt

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. P. H. Cullen, Mr. Charles M. Hay and Mr. Thomas T. Fauntleroy in support of the same, and Mr. William C. Irwin and Mr. Elliott H. Jones in opposition thereto.

23. Original. Ex parte: In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co., Petitioner.

Mr. Harry W. Standidge, in behalf of the interested parties, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion that Jennie F. Bishop, Administratrix, etc. et al. be allowed to intervene in this cause and made parties to the rule to show cause why the petition for a writ of prohibition should not be granted [illegible] M. H. [illegible], Receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. The Brooklyn Wharf Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harry L. Gandin and Mr. John D. Ellis in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph W. O'Brien and Mr. Terence M. Byrne in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Minerals Separation, Ltd., et al., Petitioners, vs. James M. Hyde.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the petitioners, leave is hereby granted to file a stipulation to correct the transcript of the record in this cause.

[illegible] Vandalia Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John A. Holland.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

322

Dernetta J. McCoy
et al., Executors,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Union Elevated Railroad
Co. et al.

Mr. J. J. Darlington
in behalf of counsel
for the plaintiffs in
error, submitted to the
consideration of the
Court a motion to
advance this cause.

174

Fred E. Barney,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles M. Way, as Receiver
of the Winslow Furniture &
Carpet Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the
State of Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

182

Jorge Dard y Tulland
et al., heirs at law, etc.,
vs. Appellants,
Enrique Cerra et al.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United
States for Porto Rico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Robert L. Greene,
Auditor, &c., et al.,
617 vs. Appellants
Louisville & Interurban
Railroad Co.
Robert L. Greene,
Auditor et al. &c., et al.
618 vs. Appellants,
Louisville Railway Co.
Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.,
642 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al. &c. et al.
Robert L. Greene et al. &c., et al.
643 vs. Appellants
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
644 vs. Appellant
Robert L. Greene et al. &c. et al.
Robert L. Greene et al. &c., et al.
645 vs. Appellants
Illinois Central Railroad Co.

It is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

232 The Newark Natural Gas & Fuel Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Newark, Ohio. This cause was argued by Mr. James H. Fitzgerald for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Frank A. Bolton of counsel for the defendant in error.

242 Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lizzie M. Mims, as Admx. This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William S. Nelson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
} Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. P. Bryan, it is ordered that J. M. [illegible], Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

22 Hans Berg, Prize Master, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Henry G. Harrison, Master, &c. — Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause

428 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. George H. Winters

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick M. Miner, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Humphrey Barton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

431 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emma F. Hart, as Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick M. Miner, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Humphrey Barton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

275 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James W. Wilson

This cause was argued by Mr. James W. Stewart, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. [illegible] Gray, of counsel for the defendant in error.

71 Swift & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Hocking Valley Railway Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. Hampton Todd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. C. M. Horn, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. William L. Day, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

115 Chicago, Milwaukee &
St. Paul Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State Public Utilities
Commission of Illinois.

This cause was argued by Mr. O. W. Dynes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Wm. F. Gallagher, of counsel for the defendant in error.

796 C. A. Starbird, Administrator, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
St. Louis, Iron Mountain
& Southern Railway Co.

On motion of Mr. Robert A. Rowe, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced for argument with case No. 275.

275 St. Louis, Iron Mountain
& Southern Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
C. A. Starbird, Administrator, &c.

796 C. A. Starbird, Administrator, &c.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
St. Louis, Iron Mountain &
Southern Railway Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Robert A. Rowe, of counsel for C. A. Starbird, Administrator, etc.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

273	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. A. Starbird, Administrator, &c.	The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Robert A. Rowe, of counsel for C. A. Starbird, Administrator, &c., and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, of counsel for the St. Louis, Iron Mountain
792	C. A. Starbird, Administrator, &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.	

and Southern Railway Company, and continued by Mr. Robert A. Rowe, of counsel for C. A. Starbird, Administrator, &c.

122 Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Texas Packing Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. W. O. Cox and Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, of counsel for the defendants in error.

141 Wellsville Oil Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Martha Miller nee Bennett, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Merillat, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Robert J. Boone, of counsel for the defendants in error.

140 F. A. Dickson, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Luck Land Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank Healy, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Marshall A. Spooner of counsel for the defendant in error.

149 John T. Bancroft, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Great Northern Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Tom Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. M. L. Countryman of counsel for the defendant in error.

637 Illinois Central Railroad Co. et al. vs. George R. Williams. Plaintiffs in Error,

This cause was argued by Mr. Blewett Lee & Mr. Forgey of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. W. F. Harrington and Mr. William H. Watkins of counsel for the defendant in error.

7 Original The State of Wyoming, Complainant vs. The State of Colorado et al.

On motion of Mr. Fred Farrar of counsel for the defendant, three counsel are allowed to argue this cause for the defendants, and three hours are allowed each side for the argument.

The argument was commenced by Mr. John W. Lacey, of counsel for the complainant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, December 7th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that James F. Winn, Esquire, of Winchester, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Roswell C. Bridger, Esquire, of Windsor, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. James H. Dickey it is ordered that Louis Rudigh, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, it is ordered that D. De Witt Woodmansee, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wyoming,
7 Original. vs. Complainant,
The State of Colorado et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John W. Lacey, of counsel for the complainant, Mr. Fred Farrar, of counsel for the State of Colorado, and Mr. Delph E. Carpenter, of counsel for the Greeley Poudre Irrigation District.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned)
until tomorrow at

Friday, December 8th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, it is ordered that Allan R. Rennick, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that John A. Kelly, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, and Luther Nickels, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, it is ordered that Rufus F. Robinson, Esquire, of Oquawka, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, it is ordered that Eugene W. Ong, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

7, Original The State of Wyoming, Complainant, vs. The State of Colorado et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Delph E. Carpenter, of counsel for the defendant, the Greeley Poudre Irrigation District, and by Mr. Julius C. Gunter, of counsel for the defendant, the Laramie Poudre Reservoir & Irrigation Company, and concluded by Mr. N. E. Corthell, of counsel for the complainant.

5110 Louisville Bridge Co., Appellant, vs. The United States. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William W. Crawford of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell of counsel for the appellant.

Adjourned

Monday, December 11th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Edward S. McGean, Esquire, of Williamsport, State of Pennsylvania; Christopher M. Bradley, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California; and Frank M. Hoyt, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Corby W. Bell, it is ordered that James Holland Moore, Esquire, of Grand Rapids,

an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evans Browne it is ordered that William H. Orrick, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Van Dalsip, it is ordered that Augustus W. Clapp, Esquire, of St Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Dunn, it is ordered that John C. Parkinson, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Graves, it is ordered that Sumter McDaniel, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

by Mr. Scott Ferris, it is ordered that H. D. Henry, Esquire, of Mangum, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willard Saulsbury, it is ordered that Richard S. Rodney, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rome G. Brown, it is ordered that August T. Raske, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cyrus Cline, it is ordered that R. E. Tolan, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

119 Long Sault Development Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Homer D. Call (as successor
of John J. Kennedy) as Treasurer of the State of New York

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed, for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Justice Pitney.

Minerals Separation, Limited,
and Minerals Separation
American Syndicate, Limited,
116 vs. Petitioners.
James M. Hyde.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same versed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana be and the same is hereby modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Detroit United Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Michigan.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke
Chief Justice White

11 The Detroit United Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Detroit

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke
Mr. Justice Brandeis

81 Vandalia Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Public Service Commission of Indiana, as the successor of The Railroad Commission of Indiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

(Mr. Justice Black took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.
[illegible] vs.	
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(32)

The United States, Interstate Commerce Commission and The Crew Levick Co. Appellants vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

60

Goshen Manufacturing Co. Petitioner vs. Hubert A. Myers Manufacturing Co. and Hubert A. Myers.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the W

Court of Louisiana for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

for Mr Justice McKenna

123 Benito Lovato,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of New Mexico.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

17 W. H. Cissna,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Tennessee.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby restored to the docket, and assigned for hearing at the same time, and immediately after, the coming on for hearing of the case of The State of Arkansas, complainant, v. The State of Tennessee, No. 6, Original, October Term 1916, and to the end that the hearing may be expedited, if the facts in No. 6, Original, be stipulated by the parties either by reference to the facts shown in this case or otherwise, both cases will be heard on submission on printed briefs of the parties are so ordered, or if they are not so ordered, upon an agreement and stipulation as to the facts in the case of The State of Arkansas v. The State of Tennessee, that case and this case will be advanced and assigned for argument at an early day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Original

The New York Electric Lines Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
William J. Gaynor et al., Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of error herein; It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

586

Eighteen Packages of Dental Instruments, Samuel Rubin, Claimant,
Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from and In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal and the writ of error in this cause be is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

159 John F. Bancroft, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Great Northern Railway Co.	In Error to the District Court of Lyon County, State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Lyon County, State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Jennette G. McCoy, et al., Executors, &c., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Union Elevated Railroad Co., et al.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered, by the Court that said motion be, and

the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

797

Francis M. Wilson, U. S. Attorney, etc., Appellant, vs. Alexander Ness et al., Receivers, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

722

Hans Berg, Prize Master, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Henry G. Harrison, Master etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, with No. 650.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible]

The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. Illinois Central Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the signed for that day.

per Mr Chief Justice White

William McCoach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs Insurance Company of North America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr Chief Justice White

The United States vs Ratcliffe Emes, Jesse T. Moorehead.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr Chief Justice White

The United States, vs Lesley S. Walker and Herman S. Walker.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said mo-cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

783 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, &c., it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

764 First National Bank of Bay City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Grant Fellows, Attorney General, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned, for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

269 The State of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Deseret Water, Oil & Irrigation Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William C. Hager.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co. of Philadelphia,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Gold Issue Mining & Milling Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
William J. McWhirt.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

S. A. Hays, Collector,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

The consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

567	H. H. Haines, Receiver, etc., Petitioner vs. The Buckeye Wheel Co. et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

609	National Bank of Commerce of Rochester, Petitioner vs. William B. Grandison, as Trustee, etc.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the

same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

758 D. Brown et al., Petitioners, vs. J. R. Chapman et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

2 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Simmons et al. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause: Thereupon, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

181 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John L. Billard

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

365 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sven Hoglund

1101 The United States of America
vs.
Solomon Louis Ginsburg.

461 Motion Picture Patents Company et al
vs. Appellants,
The United States.

649 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Solomon Kanefsky

685 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Matthew T. Caldwell et al

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these causes.

[illegible] The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Charles Schwartz et al
The United States,
75, 776. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Edward O'Toole et al.

[illegible] Le Pong alias Le Bong
vs. Petitioner.
James H. Dunn,
Inspector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr John H. Bruninghausen in support of the same, and Mr Solicitor General Davis and Mr Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

525 The Wichita Falls & Northwestern Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
J. H. Puckett.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr C. B. Stuart, Mr A. C. Cruce and Mr W. A. Cruce in support of the same, and Mr Joseph W. Bryson and Mr Alexander Britton in opposition thereto.

[illegible] The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or transfer the same to was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Allan D. Cole in support of the same, and Mr. E. L. Worthington, Mr. Wm. D. Cockran and Mr. L. Wright Browning in opposition thereto.

748
Marian McAllister, as Administratrix, &c., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. et al.

Mr. Allan D. Cole, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause pursuant to the thirty second rule.

878
St. Joseph & Grand Island Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ralph W. Moore.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or transfer the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John G. Parkinson in support of the same, and Mr. Robert A. Brown in opposition thereto.

809
W. H. Washington, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles [illegible] and Mr. S. W. Hayes in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant

Williams in opposition thereto.

782. John [illegible] Lumber Co., Petitioner, vs. [illegible] Lumber Co. Limited. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank M. Hoyt and Mr. Nathan Curtis Jr. in support of the same.

569. The Valley Steamship Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John J. Wattawa.
570. The Valley Steamship Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Mraz.
— Mr. F. C. Bryan, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

570. The Valley Steamship Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Mraz. — Mr. F. C. Bryan, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to dispense with printing the record in this cause.

[illegible] The Cuyahoga River Power Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Northern Realty Co. et al. — Mr. C. B. Ellis, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court with the reproduction of a certain map in the transcript of the record in this cause.

540 Louisville Bridge Co., Appellant, vs. The United States. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of counsel for the appellant.

703 The Savings Bank of Danbury etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Dietrich E. Loewe, etc. — This cause was argued by Mr. W. T. Tummany of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt and Mr. Daniel Davenport, of counsel for the defendants in error.

606 H. Snowden Marshall, Appellant, vs. Robert B. Gordon, Sergeant at Arms, etc. — *The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles P. Spooner of counsel for the appellant.

*On motion of Mr. J. C. Adkins thirty five minutes additional are allowed each side in the argument of this case.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, December 12th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Sloan, it is ordered that Matthew H. Weiss, Esquire, of Hebron, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Bradford, it is ordered that Edmund Kochly, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. G. Foster, it is ordered that [illegible] Stebbins, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Green it is ordered that Henry E. Sampson, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Davenport, it is ordered that A. L. McCarthy, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, it is ordered that Frank L. Odell, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Armour Packing Co.,
Morris & Co., Swift & Co.,
Hammond Packing Co.,
and St. Louis Dressed
Beef & Provision Co.,
300 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Missouri on
the relation of John T.
Barker, Attorney General

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

686 H. Snowden Marshall,
vs. Appellant,
Robert B. Gordon, Sergeant
at Arms, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles P. Spooner, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. D. Cady Herrick, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, of counsel for the appellant.

1193	P. L. Crane, vs. Appellant, Hiram W. Johnson, Governor &c. et al.	These causes were argued by Mr. Frank L. Johnston of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Robert M. Clarke and Mr. Thomas Lee Woolwine of counsel for the appellees.
1194	Kate P. McNaughton vs. Appellant, Hiram W. Johnson, Governor, &c., et al.	

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, December 13th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Martin, it is ordered that Abram P. Staples, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Murray, it is ordered that R. A. Gresham, Esquire, of Sweetwater, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Paul A. Neuffer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

84 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. R. Cress.
78 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Achilles Kelly et al.

These causes were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. F. Wise of counsel for the defendant in error in case No. 84.

286 Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Sargent Land Co.
287 Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Sutton Land Co.
288 Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. [illegible] Land Co.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Asst Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John R. Van Derlip, of counsel for the respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Monday December 11th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Charles D. Lawrence, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

503 The United States, Appellant,
vs.
United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause: and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, presented opposition thereto.

Fred Von Baumbach,
Collector of Internal Revenue,
286 vs. Petitioner,
Sargent Land Co.
Fred Von Baumbach,
Collector of Internal Revenue,
287 vs. Petitioner,
Sutton Land Co.
Fred Von Baumbach,
Collector of Internal Revenue,
288 vs. Petitioner,
Kinney Land Co.

The argument of these causes was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the petitioner.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.,
50 vs. Appellant,
The United States.
The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co.,
58 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. J. M. Dickinson, of counsel for the appellants, two hours additional time is allowed each side in the argument of these causes. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. J. M. Dickinson, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. John G. Johnson, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, December 15th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Amos L. Beaty, it is ordered that J. Q. Mahaffey, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. [illegible], it is ordered that Henry E. Monroe, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

dore Bland Hay, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey it is ordered that Vance H. Faben, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Barnard, it is ordered that George H. Inver, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

125 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Charles W. Needham in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

114 The Manufacturers Light & Heat Co., The Manufacturers Gas Co. et al., Appellants, vs. Lee Ott, Howard N. Ogden, Charles H. Bronson and Wm. M. O. Dawson, Public Service Commissioners of the State of West Virginia.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that

for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

30 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

38 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

The reargument of these cases was concluded by Mr John G. Johnson, of counsel for the appellants.

23 Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner, vs. John Mitchell, individually et al.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the petitioner, and continued by Mr Charles E. Hogg, of counsel for the respondents, and Mr Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, December 18th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James E. McGrath, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. T. H. Anderson it is ordered that Frederick J. Drake, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William V. Hodges, it is ordered that Louis N. Lietz, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Barton Keshaw, it is ordered that William A. McKenna, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Loring N. Hoover, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, it is ordered that Arthur C. Spencer, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that Francis J. Hamblen, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Peyton, it is ordered that Edwards W. Roberts, Esquire, of Minden, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Rogers, it is ordered that Alexander Wheeler, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Terrell, it is ordered that L. Melendez King, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Walter N. Cunningham, Esquire, of Cristobal, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

123

Christopher L. Williams, as Receiver of the First National Bank of Mineral Point, Wisconsin, Appellant,	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
vs.	
John P. Cobb.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof,

whereof, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

28 Erie Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James T. Welsh.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Stineman Coal Mining Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

66	Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., vs. (Plaintiff in Error, Ohio Valley Tie Co.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

77	Illinois Central Railroad Co., vs. (Plaintiff in Error, Robert H. Peery	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.,
285 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
James B. Wilson.

In Error to the Appellate Court, First District, State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court, First District, State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Appellate Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chicago, Terre Haute & Southeastern Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Champion B. Anderson.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Indiana; and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex parte: In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co.,
25, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion of John F. Dickelp, Administrator, etc., et al. to be allowed to intervene herein and make return to rule to show cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, and that Monday, January 8th next, be substituted for the return day to the rule heretofore issued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Arkansas,
10, Original. vs. Complainant,
The State of Mississippi.

To enable the State of Mississippi for the purposes of the prosecution of this cause, to procure an attested copy of Tennett's map of the State of Mississippi of 1847, It is ordered that the Clerk certify to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, in whose custody the map referred to now is, that an attested copy of the same is necessary for the purposes of the cause, and that a copy of this order be transmitted to the Chief of Engineers along with the tion.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

178 Charles Schweinler Press, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

In Error to the Court of Special Sessions, First District, New York City, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Special Sessions, First District, New York City, State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

185 The Wichita Falls & Northwestern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. H. Puckett.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdic

342 The Cuyahoga River Power Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Northern Realty Co., et al.

On consideration of the motion to dispense with the reproduction of a certain map in the transcript of record in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

470 The Valley Steamship Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Wattawa.

On consideration of the motion to dispense with printing the transcript of record in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

365 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sven Hoglund.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

61 Motion Picture Patents Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday April 9th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

69 The Valley Steamship Co. vs. John J. Wattawa. ([illegible])

70 The Valley Steamship Co. vs. Joseph Mray. ([illegible])

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday January 8th next, with case No. 672.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] The United States of America vs. Solomon Louis Ginsberg.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

649 The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Solomon [illegible].

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

683 The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mathew J. Treadwell, et al.

684 The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles Hambley et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

770 & 771 The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Edmund C. [illegible] et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

545 The United States
vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery
Co. of New Jersey et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th. next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

434 The Chesapeake & Ohio
Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John W. Shaw.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

578 The St. Joseph & Grand
Island Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ralph W. Moore.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Marion Mc. Allister,
Administratrix, &c.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The Chesapeake & Ohio
Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

790 John Schroeder Lumber Co.
vs. Petitioner,
Murray Lumber Co. Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

808 Lo Pong alias Lo Bong,
vs. Petitioner,
James R. Dunn,
Inspector, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

187 W. H. Washington, vs. Petitioner, The United States. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos 547, 631, 565, 448, 491, 622 and 623, 695, 269, 308, 384, 704, 454, 573 and 748, be assigned for argument on Monday, January 22d. next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Friday, the 22d. instant, to Monday, January 8th next.

748 International Lumber Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The United States. | Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance

docket

596 Eugenio Kilayco,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause or to place the same on the summary docket.

124 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

782 Union Fish Co.,
Petitioner.
vs.
John W. Erickson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. S. Arnold in support of the same.

791 Alexander M. Emerson,
Petitioner,
vs.
Warren E. Sweetser

792 Alfred P. Lowell,
Petitioner,
vs.
Warren E. Sweetser

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sherman Whipple in support of the same.

Ellis L. Pepper, Receiver, &c.,
1144 vs. Appellant,
Springfield Institution for
Savings et al.
Springfield Institution for
Savings et al.
1145 vs. Appellants,
Ellis L. Pepper, Receiver, etc.

Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of counsel, suggested the death of Ellis L. Pepper, the appellant in case No. 1144, and the appellee in case No. 1145, and moved the Court to make Charles A. Korbly, his successor as Receiver of The Pynchon National Bank of Springfield, the party appellant in case No. 1144 and the party appellee in case No. 1145. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that Charles A. Korbly as Receiver of The Pynchon National Bank of Springfield be, and he is hereby, made the party appellant in case No. 1144 and the party appellee in case No. 1145 in place of the said Ellis L. Pepper, deceased.

Ellis L. Pepper, Receiver, &c.,
1144 vs. Appellant,
Springfield Institution for
Savings et al.
Springfield Institution for
Savings et al.
1145 vs. Appellants,
Ellis L. Pepper, Receiver, &c.

On motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, passed for stipulation of counsel.

817 Caroline T. Hogg, Petitioner,
vs.
Lascelles E. Maxwell et al., Executors, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Louis A. Gitz and Mr. William C. Cooke in support of the same, and Mr. William A. W. Stewart in opposition thereto.

771 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Alice Frances Brown et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Francis I. Gowen in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas Raeburn White in opposition thereto.

784 Robert F. Work et al., Petitioners,
vs.
F. Thomas Parker et al., &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Hart Anderson in support of the same.

[illegible] William J. Crestmore, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Norman B. Hunt, Mr. E. C. McClelland, Mr. C. E. Bunnell, Mr. A. C. Brown, Mr. M. A. Crane, Mr. J. C. [illegible] and Mr. [illegible] lee in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

782. Seaboard Air Line Railway, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Cynthia Williams, Administratrix, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. Boyd Evans in support of the same, and Mr. J. W. S. Sykes in opposition thereto.

23. Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., vs. Petitioner, John Mitchell individually, et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Hannis Taylor of counsel for the petitioner.

[illegible] Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co., vs. Appellant, Thomas W. Rowe, individually, &c., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George R. E. Gilchrist and Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. John A. Howard, of counsel for the appellees.

106	Furness Withy & Co. Limited, Petitioners, vs. Yang-Tsze Insurance Association, Limited, et al. Mr. Roger Englar and Mr. [illegible] for the respondents.	Argument of the Petitioners' cause commenced by Mr. Fos- ter [illegible] of counsel for the petitioners, continued by Mr. [illegible] of coun-

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. [illegible], it is ordered that John S. Hummer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] Browne, it is ordered that Irving S. Olds, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this d
by Mr. W. W. Wilson, it is ordered that Rich
Constable, Esquire, of Chicago Heights, State of
nois, be admitted to practice as an attorney an
counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac
ingly

On motion first made to the Court in this b
by Mr. George W. Norris, it is ordered that J
W. Blackburn, Esquire, of Omaha, and C. Pet
Peterson, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebras
be admitted to practice as attorneys and couns
lors of this Court, and they were sworn accor

On motion first made to the Court on this
by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that David
Baer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Colu
be admitted to practice as an attorney and
sellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordin

On motion first made to the Court on this b
by Mr. B. S. Grosscup, it is ordered that J. T.
Lyle, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washingto
be admitted to practice as an attorney and c
sellor of this Court, and he was sworn accord

824 C. W. Simmons et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
William Copeland.

The petition for a wr
of certiorari herein w
submitted to the cons
ation of the Court o
printed arguments by Mr. [illegible]

Mr. William H. Oppenheimer in support of the same and Mr. William D. Mitchell, in opposition thereto.

744 The United States vs. Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari to bring up the whole record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Stuart, Mr. John G. Shea and Mr. Joseph C. Stone, of counsel for Bessie Wildcat et al., in support of the same.

407 Bettie E. Yandeau, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Moses Whitmire et al. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, or to place the same on the summary docket, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Jacob W. Hartman in support of the same and Mr. Roger Foster in opposition thereto.

632 Memphis Street Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. J. W. Rich, Administrator, &c. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in [illegible] of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

130

U. S. Jones
vs. Plaintiffs in Error
W. S. Crumb et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. W. Stuart, Mr. A. C. Evans, Mr. M. R. Evans, Mr. W. F. Evans and Mr. W. W. Hickman of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. J. H. Worst and Mr. R. M. Campbell of counsel for the defendants in error.

186

Furness Withy & Co. Limited,
vs. Petitioner.
Yang Tsze Insurance Association, Limited et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Norman B. Beecher of counsel for the petitioner.

118

Josie C. Baker, individually and as Administratrix, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Baker, Eccles & Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John A. Pitts of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles R. Wheeler of counsel for the defendants.

in court,

113 John L. Fleming et al.,
vs. (Plaintiffs in Error,
Green McCurtain et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. James K. Vinsey, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Robert J. Boone, of counsel for the defendants in error.

101 Western Transit Co.
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
A. C. Leslie Co., Limited.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lester F. Gilbert, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday December 20th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Kenyon, it is ordered that Ernest Lundeen, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Connolly, it is ordered that Clement R. Dickey, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Johnson, it is ordered that Mark Evans, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

104 Western Transit Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
A. C. Leslie & Co., Limited.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Lester F. Gilbert, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and the cause was submitted on a printed brief by Mr. Daniel J. Kenefick, of counsel for the defendant in error.

85 J. C. Hawkins
vs. Appellant,
John L. Bleakley,
Auditor, etc., et al.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Robert Ryan of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Henry E. Sampson, of counsel for the appellees.

106 Thomas Cusack Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of Chicago et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John F. Hummer of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Loring R. Hoover and Mr. Chester E. Cleveland of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday December 28th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, it is ordered that H. A. van C. Torchiana, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

126. Thomas Cusack Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Chicago et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Chester E. Cleveland, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. John P. Wilson of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Wm. J. Lee Martin, etc.
vs. Petitioner,
San Francisco & Portland Steamship Co., Claimant &c.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be granted Mr. Edmund S. McClanahan to file a reply brief for the petitioners herein within ten days. The cause was argued by Mr. Edmund S. McClanahan, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. J. Carter Rucker, of counsel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Frank S. Wright, it is ordered that George B. Marty, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

55

John Williams, chief;
Michael Williams, secretary, et al.,
vs. Appellants,
City of Chicago et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. G. Grossberg, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. H. S. Mecartney and Mr. Chester E. Cleveland, of counsel for the appellees.

Friday, December 22nd, 1916, continued.

129 The Board of Trustees of the Sevilleta de La Joya Grant, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Trustees of the Belen Land Grant.

This cause was argued by Mr. Neill B. Field, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Samuel Herrick, of counsel for the defendant in error.

131 C. E. Gannon, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. H. Johnston et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. A. C. Cruce, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Monday January 8th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Gregory, it is ordered that Samuel Seabury, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Richard Campbell, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands; Edwin P. Cox, Esquire, of Richmond, and Richard H. Mann, Esquire, of Petersburg, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court; and they were sworn accordingly.

by Mr. H. L. Macartney it is ordered that Edward J. Adair, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Eastall, it is ordered that John Quinn, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue, it is ordered that Marvel Mills Logan, Esquire, of Brownsville, and John L. Riddle, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, it is ordered that John Hamilton Hartpence, Esquire, of Trenton, and Edward L. Stout, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Robinson, it is ordered that G. Willard Rich, Esquire, of Rochester, State of ney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr Joseph F. O'Connell, it is ordered that Daniel T. O'Connell, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Louis J. Vorhaus, it is ordered that Charles J. Campbell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Alexander H. Elder and John J. Hickey, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Charles E. Bolsterling, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Henry H. Gilfry, it is ordered that Oliver P. Coshow, Esquire, of Roseburg, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that James Raleigh Kelly, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and Lawrence B. Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that John S. Lehmann, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Small, it is ordered that James G. Martin, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Hagerman, it is ordered that Clyde Taylor, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] Raymond Barnett, it is ordered that

Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Murray, it is ordered that Adolphus Madden Works, Esquire, of Hugo, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Illinois Central Railroad Co. and Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co. and Canton, Aberdeen & Nashville Railroad Co., and Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans Railroad Co., their lessee,
637 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
George R. Williams

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

70 Claude M. Dean, Appellant, vs. R. Bruce Davis, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of A. Crowley Jones, Bankrupt, and W. W. Wilkes, Substituted Trustee.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

101 Western Transit Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. C. Leslie & Co., Limited.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

121 John Armstrong Chaloner vs. Thomas T. Sherman. Plaintiff in Error. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

98 Knauth, Nachod & Kühne, Petitioners, vs. Latham & Company et al. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

219 Max Joffe et al., surviving members of the firm of [illegible], Michael & Nathans,
vs. Appellants,
William S. Lovell, as Custodian, etc., and as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knight, Yancey & Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

280	Max Jaffe et al., surviving members of the firm of Knauth, Nachod & Kühne, Appellants, vs. Maurice E. A. Westphalen et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

106	Furness, Withy & Co., Petitioner, vs. Yang Tsze Insurance Association, Limited, et al.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

John Williams, Chief;
Michael Williams,
Secretary, et al.
88 vs. Appellants,
City of Chicago, Illinois
Central Railroad Co., et
al.

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States for
the Northern District
of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Lake Shore & Michigan
Southern Railway Co.,
Chicago, Indiana & Southern Railroad Co. and
Michigan Central Railroad Co.
87 vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Simeon Clough, The Toleston Club of Chicago, Charles
C. Porter et al.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

112. Jesse L. Harnage and The Dobskin Gas & Oil Co., Plaintiffs in Error vs. Annie M. Martin and Rock, Argue & Marie Wacher Oil Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

113. Josie E. Baker individually and as Administratrix of Charles Baker deceased, Plaintiff in Error vs. Baker, Eccles & Co., and Augusta H. Baker individually and as Administratrix of Charles Baker, deceased.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Pitney

The Newark Natural Gas & Fuel Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Newark, Ohio	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio

232

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Pitney

Louisville Bridge Co., Appellant vs. The United States.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky

540

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Harry F. Hill, a minor, and J. B. Hill, a minor, by their next friend and legal guardian, Dave Hill, and Louis James, by his legal guardian, (Plaintiffs in Error), vs. Frank Reynolds, a minor.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

61

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Edmund Vaughan Gregant, (Plaintiff in Error), vs. George F. Lapeyre and Marshal Lapeyre.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

116

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Lo

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

100 F. A. Dickson, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Luck Land Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

58 Emil F. Adamson, Petitioner,
vs.
David C. Gilliland.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is here-

and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.,
420 vs Plaintiff in Error.
George H. Winters

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

The Savings Bank of Danbury, of Danbury, Connecticut,
78 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Dietrich E. Loewe, as surviving partner of the firm of D. E. Loewe & Co.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

No 5

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

P. L. Crane, Appeal from the
493 vs. Appellant, District Court of the
Hiram W. Johnson, Governor United States for the
of the State of California, et Southern District of
al. California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Kate C. McNaughton, Appeal from the
494 vs. Appellant, District Court of
Hiram W. Johnson, Governor the United States
of the State of California, et al. for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

55 The James Clark' Distilling Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The Western Maryland Railway Co., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

56 The James Clark' Distilling Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The American Express Co., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.)
Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

150 U. S. Jones, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. S. Combs, Flora Butler, Nettie Kuhl et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

421 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emma F. Nash, as Administratrix of the Estate of John Emmett Nash, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

509
International Lumber Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

598
Eugenio Villegas,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

607
Walton S. [illegible],
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
[illegible] et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

782 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs Cynthia Williams, Administratrix, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.
per Mr Chief Justice White

781 The United States vs Bessie Wildcat, a minor et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit to bring up the entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted. It is further ordered that the certified copy of the transcript of the record presented with the petition stand as and for a return to the writ of certiorari.
per Mr Chief Justice White

784 Robert F. Black et al., Petitioners, vs F. Thomas Parker et al. etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is here

787 Union Fish Co., Petitioner,
vs.
John W. Erickson.
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

791 Alexander M. Emerson, Petitioner,
vs.
Warren E. Swetser.
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

795 Alfred P. Lowell, Petitioner,
vs.
Warren E. Swetser.
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

771

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Alice Frances Brown et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

817

Caroline F. Hogg, Petitioner, vs. Lucelles C. Maxwell et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this

hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

618 William J. Cornnissen, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] E. C. Emmons et al., Petitioners, vs. William Cleveland. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

20 Original. The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. S. W. Williams in support of the same, and Mr. Harvey M. Friend in opposition thereto.

853. Juan Gatmaitan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having presented in open court the following certificate, viz:

"The United States of America,
Philippine Islands.
In the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

I, V. Albert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said court wherein the United States was complainant and Juan Gatmaitan was defendant, I issued a certificate to the effect that a final judgment was rendered by the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands on July 20, 1915, in favor of the said United States and against the said Juan Gatmaitan, and through error stated that on July 26, 1915, said Juan Gatmaitan prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States which was allowed, whereas in reality a writ of error to the writ; and I therefore, accordingly correct the said certificate so as to read as follows:

The United States of America
Philippine Islands

In the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

I, V. Albert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein The United States was plaintiff, and Juan Catmaitan was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the twentieth day of July, A.D. 1915, in favor of the said United States, and against the said Juan Catmaitan, and that on the twenty sixth day of July, A.D. 1915, said Juan Catmaitan sued out a writ of error to said Supreme Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Supreme Court, at Manila, P.I. this seventeenth day of November, A.D. 1916

Seal.

V. Albert,
Clerk of the Supreme Court
of the Philippine Islands"

move the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 9th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

858 Juan Gatmaitan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandate in this cause.

854 Lorenzo Dong Chongco, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having presented in open court the following certificate, viz:

"The United States of America,
Philippine Islands.
In the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

I, V. Albert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said court, wherein the United States was complainant and Lorenzo Dong Chongco was defendant, I issued a certificate to the effect that a final judgment was rendered by

April 9, 1915, in favor of the said United States and against the said Lorenzo Dong Chingco, and through error stated that on April 15, 1915 said Lorenzo Dong Chingco prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States which was allowed, whereas in reality a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States was sued out; and I therefore, accordingly correct the said certificate so as to read as follows:

The United States of America
Philippine Islands.
In the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

I, V. Albert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein The United States was plaintiff and Lorenzo Dong Chingco was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the ninth day of April, A.D. 1915, in favor of the said United States, and against the said Lorenzo Dong Chingco, and that on the twenty sixth day of April, A.D. 1915 said Lorenzo Dong Chingco sued out a writ of error to said Supreme Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Seal.

In testimony whereof, I
hereunto subscribe my name
and affix the seal of said
Supreme Court, at Manila,
P.I., this seventeenth day of
November, A.D. 1916.

Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands," moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 9th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

854 Lorenzo Dong Changco,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandate in this cause.

1142 & 1143 Manufacturers' Railway Co. et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States et al.

It is ordered by the Court that these causes be and they are hereby assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Monday, January 8th, 1917 continued.

621 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Foster L. Davis

Mr Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

778 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Appellant,
vs.
Robert L. Greene, Auditor of Public Accounts, et al. &c. et al.

779 Robert L. Greene, Auditor of Public Accounts, et al. &c. et al., Appellants,
vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

On motion of Mr Helm Bruce, of counsel for the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument with case No. 617, etc.

823 The Hewitt Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The United States Metallic Packing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr James H. Lyons and Mr George C. Hale in support of the same, and Mr. Francis T. Chambers in opposition thereto.

780 Illinois Central Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Marshall Jones, Administratrix, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gustave Lemle, Mr. Hunter C. Leake, Mr. Blewett Lee and Mr. R. V. Fletcher of counsel for the plaintiff in error in support thereof.

815 Alaska Salmon Co., Petitioner, vs. The Territory of Alaska. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren Gregory, Mr. George H. Whipple, Mr. E. S. McCord, and Mr. W. H. Bogle in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto.

843 Robert Edward Baker et al., Petitioners, vs. J. J. Dunlop. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard H. Mann, Mr. Edwin P. Cox, and Mr. Conrad H. Syme in support of the same.

80 J. F. Nebel, Petitioner, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court [illegible]

[illegible] and Mr. C. P. [illegible] in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

831 Omaha Iron Store Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Moline Plow Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Otto Raymond Barnett in support of the same and Mr. Samuel Walker Banning and Mr. Thomas A. Banning in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Bruno J. Bernhard,
Original Petitioner.

Mr. Charles B. Gillson, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

858 The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Grand Transportation Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Austin J. McMahon, Mr. William S. Jenney and Mr. Louis Marshall in support of the same.

564 Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Elizabeth A. Mulligan, as Administratrix, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the cause on the summary docket, etc. was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce in support of the motion, and [illegible] Mr. P. A. Willcox and Mr. F. B. McKinney in opposition thereto.

Original. The Republic of Cuba, Plaintiff,
vs.
The State of North Carolina.

On motion of Mr. Barry Mohun in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff leave is hereby granted to withdraw the motion for leave to file declaration in this cause.

351 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Nora Gottschall, as Administratrix, etc.

Mr. George H. Lamar in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to place this cause on the summary docket.

352 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
J. D. Barr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of

William H. Bremner and Mr. Frederick M. Mi[illegible] in support of the same.

810 Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Petitioner,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

811 Alaska Mexican Gold Mining Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

812 Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Petitioner,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry M. Friend in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto.

218 J. Fred Katzmann, Trustee, &c., Appellant,
vs.
Mining Trust Co., Re[illegible] et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Seymour E. Hunter and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren in support of the same, and Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone in opposition thereto.

280 Southern Pacific Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Marie Jensen.

On motion of Mr. C. M. Bradley in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause, as amicus curiae.

828
Detroit Iron & Steel Co.,
Petitioner
vs.
James D. Carey

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George W. Marky and Mr. Charles K. Miller in support of the same and Mr. Albert Lynn Lawrence in opposition thereto.

46
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ohio Valley Tie Co.

On motion of Mr. Edward W. Hines, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandate in this cause.

374
Jesse Isidor Straus et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Victor Talking Machine Co.

On motion of Mr. Elisha K. Camp in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief as amici curiae for the American Graphophone Co. and Columbia Graphophone Co.

577
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Clark Brothers.

578
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
[illegible]

The motions to dismiss or affirm in these causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Kent and Mr. George S.

Adams, and leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file brief in opposition thereto within four days.

783 Dr. Paul Oesting alias Paul Olten, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James Raleigh Kelly and Mr. Charles J. Heygate in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

819 American Bank of Alaska, Petitioner, vs. Edwin Richards.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James Raleigh Kelly and Mr. Charles J. Heygate in support of the same, and Mr. W. H. Metson in opposition thereto.

782 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. H. Lorick.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, or place the same on the summary docket, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank G. Tompkins in support

360	Clark Pease, Petitioner, vs. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Co.	These cases were submitted pursuant to the 3rd rule on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Perry J. Lewis of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Charles Rex, of counsel for the respondent.
409	Clark Pease et al. Petitioners, vs. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Co.	

372 Board of Councilmen of the City of Frankfort et al. Appellants, vs East Tennessee Telephone Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

380 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Appellant, vs Western Union Telegraph Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

[illegible] Willie Hope, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. T. Foley et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

797 Francis M. Wilson, U. S. Attorney, etc., Appellant, vs. Alexander New et al., Receivers. — On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, four hours are allowed each side in the argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation having been made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Hardwick, it is ordered that H. J. MacIntyre, Esquire, of Thomasville, and Emmett Houser, Esquire, of Fort Valley, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Oscar J. Horn, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Francis H. Boland, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Sterling it is ordered that Daniel Ross, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, it is ordered that William B. Rodman, Esquire, of Washington, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Elmer E. Hershey, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] S. Tyler, it is ordered that Edgar A. [illegible], Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

ence Cahill, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

651
The Arizona Eastern
Railroad Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. H. Bryan.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Thomas Armstrong, Mr. Everett W. Lewis and Mr. G. T. Bullard in support of the same.

527
The United States,
vs. Appellant,
Daniel J. Leary, et al.

The motions to dismiss in this cause were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Aubrey E. Strode and Mr. Abram J. Rose in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Marion Erwin in opposition thereto.

787
Francis M. Wilson,
United States Attorney, &c.,
vs. Appellant,
Alexander New et al.
Receivers, &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Walker D. Hines and Mr. John G. Johnson of counsel for the appellees and Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellants,

Wednesday January 10th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. S. Gregory, it is ordered that Hamilton Moses, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. McLaughlin, it is ordered that Alexander Sutherland, Esquire, of Muskegon, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Frederick L. Leckie, it is ordered that Henry H. Duncan, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

668 William R. Staats Co. et al., Appellants, vs. Security Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Jefferson P. Chandler in support of the same and Mr. H. W. O'Melveny, Mr. Alexander Britton, and Mr. Evans Browne in opposition thereto.

797 Francis M. Wilson, United States Attorney, &c., Appellant, vs. Alexander New et al., Receivers, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank Hagerman of counsel for the appellant.

438 The John Church Co., Petitioner, vs. Hilliard Hotel Co., et al.

427 Victor Herbert et al., Petitioners, vs. The Shanley Co.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Louis J. Vorhaus of counsel for the petitioner in No. 438, continued by Mr. Charles F. Campbell of counsel for the respondents in No. 438; Mr. Nathan Burkan of counsel for the petitioners in No. 427 and Mr.

assisted by Mr. Louis J. Vorhaus of counsel for the petitioner in No. 238

George Schwede 512 vs. Zenith Steamship Co. The Valley Steamship Co. 469 vs. Plaintiff in Error. John J. Wattawa The Valley Steamship Co. 470 vs. Plaintiff in Error Joseph Manz	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frank M. Cobb, of counsel for George Schwede.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
~~Joseph McKenna~~
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund E. Wise it is ordered that John L. Lolock, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery it is ordered that George R. Allen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Homer English, Esquire, of Bloomington, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. B. F. Macfarland, it is ordered that John L. [illegible], Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren it is ordered that James Gore King, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

George Schwede
372 vs.
Zenith Steamship Co.
The Valley Steamship Co.,
469 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
John J. Watterson
The Valley Steamship Co.
470 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Joseph Moray

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frank M. Cobb, of counsel for George Schwede; Mr. Luther Day of counsel for the Zenith Steamship Company; Mr. Tracy H. Duncan, of counsel for The Valley Steamship Company and Mr. George H. Eichelberger, of counsel for John J. Watterson and Joseph Moray, and concluded by Mr. Harold B. Goulder of

679	Warren Horn, Appellant, vs. John G. Mitchell United States Marshal, &c.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph F. O'Connell, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Friday, January 12th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hector T. Fenton, it is ordered that John Dashiell Myers, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel W. O'Donoghue, it is ordered that William C. Woodward and Arthur A. Alexander, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

304 St. Louis Union Trust Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Mary E. Mellon et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

679 Werner Horn,
vs. Appellant,
John J. Mitchell,
United States Marshal, &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Joseph F. O'Connell, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Daniel T. O'Connell, of counsel for the appellant.

374 Jesse Isidor Straus et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Victor Talking Machine Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edmond E. Wise, of counsel for the petitioners; continued by Mr. Hector T. Fenton, of counsel for the respondent; and concluded by Mr. Walter C. Noyes, of counsel for the petitioners.

Friday, January 12th 1917 continued

193	Motion Picture Patents Co., Petitioner, vs. Universal Film Manufacturing Co., et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Melville Church, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, January 15th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that Patrick Henry Kelley, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Houston B. Teehee it is ordered that Ira Russell Ash, Esquire, of Cordell, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Ernest [illegible] Wood, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

242 Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lizzie Mims, as Administratrix of the Estate of John J. Mims, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

56 Thomas Cusack Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of Chicago, Carter H. Harrison, Mayor of the City of Chicago, and Henry Ericsson, Commissioner of Buildings of the City of Chicago.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

[illegible] [illegible]

Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
286 vs
Sargent Land Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings, if any are brought, upon claim of right to deduct the value of the lands, logs and stumpage sold from the assessments made.

per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision

Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, vs. Petitioner. Sutton Land Co.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

287

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings, if any are sought, upon claim of right to deduct the value of the lands, lots and stumpage sold from the assessments made.

per Mr. Justice Day

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, vs. Petitioner. [illegible] Land Co.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

288

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings, if any are sought, upon claim of right to deduct the value of the lands, lots and stumpage sold from the assessments made.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

139 F. Drew Caminetti, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court

California.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Chief Justice White.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

163 Maury I. Diggs, Petitioner, vs The United States. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

per Mr. Justice Day

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Chief Justice White.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the case.

464. L. T. Hays, Petitioner, vs. The United States.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Chief Justice White.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

William H. Berry, John E. Howe and Dallas C. Mott, constituting the Board of Parole of Iowa, et al., 47 Appellants, vs. Rudolph Davis	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions that the bill be dismissed without costs to either party.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Elizabeth A. Milligan, as Administratrix of the estate of W. C. Milligan, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

564

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

228	J. Fred Katzmann, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Harman Brothers, Appellant, vs. Munsey Trust Co., Receiver, Illinois Surety Co., and William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury	Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

631	The Arizona Eastern Railroad Co. and Epes Randolph and L. H. Manning, its receivers, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. A. Bryan	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said former Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Oregon.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Bernie J. Bernhard
29. Original Petitioner

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Bernie J. Bernhard
29. Original Petitioner

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Seth Shepard, Chief Justice, Honorable Charles H. Robb, and Honorable Josiah A. Van Orsdel, Associate Justices of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, February 26th, 1917, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

621 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Foster L. Davis

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

251 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Anna Gotschall, as Administratrix, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

377 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Olivit Brothers

378 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James W. Cain et al.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

762 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. H. Lorick

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary

780 Illinois Central Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Marshall Louis, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

783 Dr. Paul Oesting alias Paul Allen, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

807 J. F. [illegible], Petitioner, v. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

810 Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Petitioner, v. The Territory of Alaska. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alaska Mexican Gold Mining Co., Petitioner, vs. The Territory of Alaska. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

811

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Petitioner, vs. The Territory of Alaska. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

812

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

816 Alaska Salmon Co.
v. Petitioner
The Territory of Alaska

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

817 American Bank of Alaska
v. Petitioner
Edwin Richards

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

828 Detroit Iron & Steel Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
James D. Corey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

831 Omaha Iron Store Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
Moline Plow Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 15th, 1917, continued

838

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Sound Transportation Co.

On ^petition for^ writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible]

Robert Edward Baker et al., Trustee, etc., Petitioners,
vs.
J. J. Dunlop.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

851 The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. T. D. Davis. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

821 Lawrence Maxwell et al., &c., Petitioners, vs. Charlotte Jane Isabella McDonald et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. S. Flannery, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Frederick de Courcy Faust and Mr. Charles F. Wilson in support of the same, and Mr. Colby W. Bell and Mr. Benjamin S. Minor in opposition thereto.

27 The Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lucia Rowe. — The motion to dismiss in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Wills Bond in support of

Ex parte: In the matter of the St. Louis, Kansas City & Colorado Railroad Co., Petitioner
Original.

Mr. Thomas C. Littlepage, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions for leave to file petitions for writs of prohibition and mandamus in this cause.

595
Albert E. Sutton et al., Appellants,
vs.
John H. & L. English et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Cecil H. Smith in support of the same, and Mr. Allen C. Fisher in opposition thereto.

597
Watts, Watts & Co., Limited, Petitioner,
vs.
Unione Austriaca di Navigazione, etc.

The motion to transfer this cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. John M. Woolsey in support of the same, and Mr. Charles S. Haight in opposition thereto.

378 Old Dominion Iron & Nail Works Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. R. Pollard and Mr. Henry Taylor, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Eppa Hunton, Jr., Mr. E. Randolph Williams and Mr. Henry W. Anderson in opposition thereto.

155 Charles H. Baker et al., Appellants, vs. John W. Schofield, as Receiver, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. B. S. Grosscup and Mr. Corwin S. Shank, of counsel for the appellants and Mr. Frederick Bausman, of counsel for the appellee.

715 Motion Picture Patents Co., Petitioner, vs. Universal Film Manufacturing Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Melville Church of counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Oscar W. Jeffery, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Melville Church of counsel for the petitioner.

Monday, January 15th, 1917, continued.

Hans Berg, Prize Master, etc., et al., 650 vs. Appellants, British & African Steam Navigation Co. Hans Berg, Prize Master, etc., et al. 700 vs. Appellants, Henry G. Harrison, Master, &c.	The argument of these cases was com- menced by Mr. Frederick W. Leh- mann of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Arthur Garfield Hays, Esquire, of New York City, and Charles A. Kalberg, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wheeler, it is ordered that Thomas F. Nough, Esquire, of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Richmond D. Moot, Esquire of Schenectady, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Gilfry it is ordered that Samuel White, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hans Berg, Prize Master,
etc., et al.,
522 vs. Appellants,
Henry G. Harrison, Master, &c.

On motion of Mr. F. W. Lehmann, of counsel for the appellants, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in that behalf.

Hans Berg, Prize Master,
&c., et al.,
650 vs. Appellants,
British & African Steam
Navigation Co.
Hans Berg, Prize Master,
&c., et al.,
722 vs. Appellants,
Henry G. Harrison, Master, &c.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. F. W. Lehmann, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, and Mr. James R. Symonds, of coun-

and concluded by Mr. J. M. Dickinson of counsel for the appellants. Leave was granted counsel for the appellants to file reply to supplemental brief within ten days.

Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., &c.,
617 vs. Appellants
Louisville & Interurban Railroad Co.
Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al. &c.
618 vs. Appellants,
Louisville Railway Co.
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
642 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al. &c., et al.
Robert L. Greene et al. &c. et al.
643 vs. Appellants,
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
644 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al. &c. et al.
Robert L. Greene et al. &c. et al.
645 vs. Appellants,
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
778 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene, et al.

On motion of Mr. Henry L. Stone of counsel for the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, seven hours are allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles Carroll for Robert L. Greene et al., and continued by Mr. Alexander Pope Humphrey of counsel for the Appellees in cases Nos 617 and 618.

Tuesday, January 18th 1887 continued

178 Robert L. Evans, et al
vs. Appellants,
Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Wednesday, January 17th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., etc.
617 vs. Appellants,
Louisville & Interurban Railroad Co.

Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., etc.
618 vs. Appellants,
Louisville Railway Co.

Illinois Central Railroad Co.
642 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al. as auditor

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Alexander Pope Humphrey, of counsel for the appellants in cases Nos. 617 and 618; Mr. Blewett Lee, of counsel for the Illinois Central Railroad Company; Mr. John L. Rich, of counsel for Robert L. Greene, etc.; Mr. Edmund

Robert L. Greene, et al., &c., et al.,
643 vs. Appellants,
Illinois Central Railroad Co.

Illinois Central Railroad Co.
644 vs. Appellant
Robert L. Greene, et al., &c., et al.

Robert L. Greene, et al., &c., et al.
645 vs. Appellants,
Illinois Central Railroad Co.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.
778 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene, Auditor, &c., et al.

Robert L. Greene, Auditor, &c., et al.
779 vs. Appellants,
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

for the Illinois Central Railroad, Company; and Mr. M. M. Logan, of counsel for Robert L. Greene, et al.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Thursday, January 18th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, it is ordered that Charles Albert Perkins, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin D. Ricketts, it is ordered that John C. Pettit, Esquire, of Logan, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Thursday, January 18th, 1917, continued

F. Henry, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert J. Farrell, it is ordered that Charles F. Harvey, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rome G. Brown it is ordered that Alfred D. Lunt, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and Robertson McKenna, Esquire, of Harrodsburg, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Paul H. Blair, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and William J. Larkin, Jr., Esquire, of Waterbury, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

(61) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. Owner, &c.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Luckenbach Steamship

Mr. Charles Henry Butler submitted to the consideration of the Court a mo-present a petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause.

Robert L. Greene, Auditor
et al., etc.,
617 vs. Appellants,
Louisville & Interurban
Railroad Co.
Robert L. Greene, Auditor
et al., etc.,
618 vs. Appellants,
Louisville Railway Co.
Illinois Central Railroad
Co.,
642 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al.
Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al.,
643 vs. Appellants,
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
644 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene et al. &c. et al.
Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al.
645 vs. Appellants
Illinois Central Railroad Co.
Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.
778 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene, Auditor, &c. et al.
Robert L. Greene, Auditor, &c. et al.
779 vs. Appellants

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. M. M. Logan of counsel for Robert L. Greene et al. and concluded by Mr. Helm Bruce, of counsel for the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

Frank C. Stettler,
25 vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
Edwin V. O'Hara, et al. &c.
Elmira Simpson,
26 vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
Edwin V. O'Hara, et al. &c.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. C. W. Fulton, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. Felix Frankfurter, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday January 19th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Steele, it is ordered that William Elza Williams, Esquire, of Pittsfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jos. T. Robinson, it is ordered that Orlando A. Fuller, Esquire, of Eureka Springs, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Warren Durfree, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Robert Douglas Feagin, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that Samuel P. Goldman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grant Jarvis, it is ordered that Robert E. Hammond, Esquire, of Havre, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that Louis Burton Coleman, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

186 Public Service Gas Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, City of Paterson and City of Passaic.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. E. A. Armstrong in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

187 Public Service Gas Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Paterson and Board of Public Utility Commissioners.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. E. A. Armstrong in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

188 Public Service Gas Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Passaic and Board of Public Utility Commissioners. In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. E. A. Armstrong in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed: Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

25 Frank C. Stettler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edwin V. O'Hara, et al., &c.

26 Elmira Simpson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edwin V. O'Hara, et al., &c.

The reargument of these causes was continued by Mr. Felix Frankfurter, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Rome G. Brown, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

38	Franklin O. Bunting, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Oregon.	This cause was argued by Mr. W. Lair Thompson of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and

Mr. Felix Frankfurter of counsel for the defendant in error.

2.	Hugo Adalberto Thomsen et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, [illegible] Charles W. Cayce et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. Lee Everett of counsel for the plaintiffs in

error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned
until

Monday January 22d, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that J. S. Tribble, Esquire, of Kennett, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. R. King, it is ordered that Ottamar Hamele, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Morris, it is ordered that Harold linois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph B. Thompson, it is ordered that Charles A. Haggart, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan H. Beach, it is ordered that Lawrence L. Lewis and Michael J. Byrne, Esquires, of Waterbury, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jas. T. Robinson, it is ordered that Hill Covington, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Pearre, it is ordered that D. Taylor Smith, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that L. P. Ouslich, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jos. W. Branham, it is ordered that Mark B. Eubanks, Esquire, of Rome, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Alexander King, it is ordered that Nathan K. McGill, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, it is ordered that Eugene A. Kingman, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Board of Trustees of the Sevilleta de La Joya Grant for the benefit of the owners in common thereof,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Board of Trustees of the Belen Land Grant. — 127

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Harry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks and Banking of the State of Ohio,
vs. Appellant,
The Geiger-Jones Co. — 438

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Harry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks and Banking of the State of Ohio, Appellant,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.
75 vs.	
Dan C. Coultrap.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed, by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Harry T. Hall, Superintendent of Banks and Banking of the State of Ohio, et al. vs Appellants William R. Rose and the Ro-Colmad Auto Manufacturing Co.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

[illegible]

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General for the State of South Dakota and Ex Officio Member of the State Securities Commission of the State of South Dakota, et al., Appellants,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.
386. vs	
The Sioux Falls Stock Yards Co., William Morley and Harry Morley.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds. Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Frank W. Merrick, John W. Haarer, and Oramel B. Fuller, Appellants,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.
[illegible] vs	
N. W. Halsey & Co., et al., and The [illegible] [illegible] Corporation.	

the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna,

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

427 Victor Herbert, Harry B. Smith et al., Petitioners, vs The Shanley Co.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the

207

The John Church Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Hilliard Hotel Co. and Thomas de Martin.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes
(announced by Mr. Chief Justice White.)

133

The United States, Appellant,
vs.
American-Asiatic Steamship Co., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill without prejudice to the right of The United States in the future to assail any actual contract or combination deemed to offend against the Anti-Trust Act.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

169	The United States, Appellant, vs. Prince Line, Limited, Paul F. Gerhard, Charles L. Gerhard, Francis J. Zimmermann et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill without prejudice to the right of The United States in the future to assail any actual contract or combination deemed to offend against the Anti-Trust Act.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter
of St. Louis, Kansas City
& Colorado Railroad Co.,
— Original Petitioner.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file petitions for writs of prohibition and mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied without prejudice in any respect to relief on appeal or otherwise on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

512 Watts, Watts & Co., Limited,
vs. Petitioner
Unione Austriaca di
Navigazione, etc.

On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

795 Albert E. Sutton et al.,
vs. Appellants,
John H. C. L. English

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lawrence Maxwell and Fulton Trust Company of New York, Executors of the last will and testament of James McDonald, deceased et al.
821 vs. Petitioners,
Charlotte Jane Isabella McDonald et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Hewitt Co.,
822 vs. Petitioner,
The United States Metallic Packing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

168 American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., Owner and Claimant of the Steamship "Virginian," Petitioner, vs. Strathalbyn Steamship Co., Limited, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to present a petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted. It is further ordered that the motion for delay to give further notice be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

167 American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., Owner and Claimant of the Steamship "Virginian," Petitioner, vs. Strathalbyn Steamship Co., Limited, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

680 Western Union Telegraph Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Calvin H. Foster et al. &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Patrick Henry Kelley in support of the same, and Mr. Rush Taggart and Mr. Arthur Lord in opposition thereto.

887 Samuel G. Masters et al., Petitioners, vs. Edmund W. Wakelee, trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Daniel W. Baker, Mr. Wilson J. Lambert and Mr. C. L. Cox in support of the same and Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner in opposition thereto.

862 T. Coleman Du Pont, Petitioner, vs. George A. Gardiner, Jr., et al., Executors, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Julius F. Workum in support of the same, and Mr. L. Laflin Kellogg and Mr. Alfred C. Petté in opposition thereto.

[illegible] The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. R. [illegible] and C. H. [illegible], trading as [illegible] & [illegible].

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Adrian Bakker, Petitioner,
vs.
Netherlands-American Steam Navigation Co. and the Holland-American Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Roger Foster in support of the same, and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham in opposition thereto.

[illegible] St. Louis Union Trust Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Mary E. [illegible] et al.

On motion of Mr. Enoch A. Chase, of counsel for the ly granted to issue the mandate in this cause.

368

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William C. Hagy.

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Fifth District, Licking County, State of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Laswell Land & Lumber Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Lee Wilson & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. G. P. Tribble and Mr. Charles W. Williams in support of the same, and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan and Mr. Allen Hughes in opposition thereto.

Hugo Adalberto Brunner et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Sir Charles W. Cayzer et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. Snowden Marshall of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Thomas defendants in error and concluded by Mr. [illegible] Bennett, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The Enterprise Irrigation
District et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Tri-State Land Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr Harry N. Haynes, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Tuesday, January 2nd, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Orrick it is ordered that John T. Nourse, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that P. G. Phillips, Esquire, of Nyssa, State of Oregon, and George A. Gilmore, Esquire, of Williston, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Joseph B. Poindexter, Esquire, of Dillon, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, it is ordered that G. W. Whitney, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

98
The Enterprise Irrigation District et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Tri-State Canal Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harry A. Haynes, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Fred A. Wright and Mr. Will R. King of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Harry A. Haynes of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

32
The State of Washington ex rel. Gray's Harbor Logging Co., et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Superior Court of Washington for Chehalis County

This cause was argued by Mr. W. H. Abel, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. William M. Smith of counsel for the de

18	Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co. Appellant, vs. The United States.	The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. George A. King of counsel for the Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company.
19	The United States Appellant, vs. Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.	

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 24th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Harvey, it is ordered that William C. Bowers, 2d, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

18 Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co., Appellant,
vs.
The United States.
9 The United States, Appellant,
vs.
Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.

The reargument of these cases was continued by Mr. George A. King of counsel for the Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of

Mr. George A. King of counsel for the Atlantic Gulf & Pacific Company.

164 Union National Bank et al., Plaintiffs in Error vs. George McBoyle et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles W. Brandt of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. William H. Owen of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, January 25th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, it is ordered that Mary Florence Lathrop, of Denver, State of Colorado, and Thomas H. Payne, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy W. Mallon, it is ordered that W. S. Leslie, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: In the matter of Joseph Marshall, Petitioner.

Original.

Mr. W. C. Barnes, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* in this case, and that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

Jay C. Ziegler and Samuel F. Kress, as well for themselves as for the other stockholders of The Carnegie Trust Company, similarly situated,

[illegible] vs. Appellants,

Carnegie Trust Company, Eugene Lamb Richards et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union National Bank et al.,

[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

George W. Doyle et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William H. [illegible], of defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Charles H. Burnside, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

38 Ebert A. de Chase et al., as surviving partners &c., Appellants, vs. The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry M. Ward and Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the appellee, and leave was granted counsel for the appellants to file a reply brief on or before the 29th instant.

84 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Robert J. McKibbin.

This cause was argued by Mr. Pierce M. Brown, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Joseph A. Shay, of counsel for the defendant in error.

First Syracuse Automobile Station, Plaintiff in Error, vs. American Locomotive Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

[illegible] The Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The First National Bank of Okeana, Ohio.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence L. [illegible], of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Edward P. Moulinier, of counsel for the defendant in error.

507 Rome Railway & Light Co., Appellant, vs. Floyd County, Georgia, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John C. Doolan, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. George E. Maddox, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 26th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
James C. McReynolds Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Samuel Ashby and Henry H. Hornbrook, Esquires, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses E. Clapp, it is ordered that Samuel F. Davis, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, it is ordered that Charles D. Mahaffie, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Henry W. Dickson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; John McChord, Esquire, of Lebanon, State of Kentucky, and C. F. Newman, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that W. J. Holliday, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, it is ordered that R. M. Anderson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

	The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, David Brennan.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. Taylor Smith, of counsel
681		

error; continued by Mr. Albert A. Doub, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. George A. Pearre, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

[illegible] The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Rachel L. Thompson, as Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. M. Miner, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Humphrey Barton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

[illegible] Martin E. Donahue, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Benjamin Hoefer, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. H. Ryall, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Dan H. Ball, of counsel for the defendants in error.

[illegible] Charles C. Pennington, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Fourth National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

This cause was argued by Mr. Guy W. Mallon, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. C. Little, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Monday, January 22nd, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Gregory, it is ordered that Archibald R. Watson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Maurice Robinson, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis

Nagel, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Rogers, it is ordered that George C. Crump, Esquire, of Holdenville, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roane Waring, it is ordered that Earl King, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis, it is ordered that Frank E. Hinckley, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that David R. Castleman and W. Overton Harris, Esquires, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly by Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Robert W. Breckons, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Drayton, it is ordered that Charles Akerman, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, vs. Plaintiff in Error. Luisa Rivera	In Error to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

21

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Old Dominion Iron &
Nail Works Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway
Co. and City of Richmond.

In Error to the Su-
preme Court of
Appeals of the State
of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis
Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Bertha L. Thompson, as Ad-
ministratrix of the Estate of
Charles E. Thompson, deceased.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest similar judgments here in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

681 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, David Branson

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Western Union Telegraph Co. and United Telegram Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Calvin H. Foster and Frederick J. Macleod et al., Members of the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

765 T. Coleman Du Pont,
Petitioner,
vs.
George H. Tomkins, Jr., et al.
as Executors of the last will
and testament of George H.
Tomkins, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

767 Adrian Barker,
Petitioner,
vs.
Netherlands American
Steam Navigation Co.,
sued as Holland-American
Line.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

871 Lasswell Land & Lumber Co. Petitioner, vs. Lee Wilson & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

887 Samuel J. Masters, John W. Kinnear, et al., Petitioners, vs. Edward W. McCallahan, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

The Court will take a recess on Monday, February 5th, to Monday, March 5th, next, and it is ordered that the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th, next, be, and the same are hereby reassigned for argument on Tuesday, March 6th, next.

Charles Mason et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States, ex rel. The Fowler Car Co.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

The United States,
vs.
Bessie Wilbert, a minor, et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

369 The State of California, vs. Desert Water, Oil & Irrigation Co. Plaintiff in Error,

On motion of Mr. [illegible] in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause in behalf of The United States as amicus curiæ.

2 Original Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia.

Mr. John Garland Pollard of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and for an order to show cause herein.

777 Mrs Rose Snyder, Plaintiff in Error, vs. King County, Washington et al.

Mr. Edwin G. [illegible] of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

165 August Bay, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Merrill & Ring Logging Co.

166 F. J. McCluskey, Administrator &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Marysville & Northern Railway Co. et al.

286 William Raymond, Plaintiff in Error, vs. [illegible]

On motion of Mr. John T. [illegible] of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and they are hereby [illegible] after recess.

585 United Mine Workers of America, Petitioners, vs. A. S. Dowd, Receiver, &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry Warrum, Mr. George L. Grant and Mr. Webb Covington in support of the same, and Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., Mr. Roger D. Hull and Mr. James D. McDonough in opposition thereto.

Original Ex parte: In the matter of John P. White, as President, et al., &c., et al., Petitioners.

Mr. Joe T. Robinson, in behalf of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause.

[illegible] The State Bank of [illegible], Nebraska, Petitioner, vs. J. D. Ingram, Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg and Mr. Arthur F. Mullen in support of the same, and Mr. R. E. Evans in opposition thereto.

886 Illinois Central Rail-
road Co. et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
V. P. Messina

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. D. Minor, Mr. Edmund [illegible], Mr. Robert V. Fletcher, Mr. Blewett Lee and Mr. Charles N. Burch in support of the same, and Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. Harry Peyton in opposition thereto.

883 A. S. Cohn,
vs. Petitioner,
R. A. Malone, Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George H. Jones in support of the same, and Mr. Alexander Akerman, Mr. Charles Akerman and Mr. John D. Pope in opposition thereto.

884 Samuel Bernstein,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Talley in support of the same.

720 Chicago, Milwaukee & St.
Paul Railway Co.,
vs. [illegible] Caffarini [illegible],
Mary O'Brennan, as Adm-
inistratrix &c.

Mr. [illegible] of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to enlarge the time in

which to file designation [illegible]

record to be printed in this cause.

Original

Ex parte: In the matter of Emmanuel Phillips, Petitioner.

Mr. Harold Remington, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

1025

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. William J. Schumann.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter H. Nagel and Mr. T. M. Pierce in support of the same, and Mr. W. C. Marshall in opposition thereto.

51

Memphis Street Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. S. C. Moore, Administrator, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Keane Waring, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. S. L. W. Coulter, of counsel for the respondent.

89

Great Northern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Anna Knapp, as Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. L. Janes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Ernest A. Michel, of counsel for the defendant in error.

269 The State of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Desert Water, Oil & Irrigation Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. John T. Nourse, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles F. [illegible], of counsel for the defendant in error.

53 The Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Gold Issue Mining & Milling Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Fred Herrington, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Patrick Henry Cullen, of counsel for the defendant in error.

[illegible] Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William J. McWhirt.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Elliott [illegible] Jones of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until

Tuesday, January 2nd, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that James R. Barbour, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, it is ordered that [illegible] R. [illegible], Esquire, of Huron, and U. S. G. Cherry, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accord-

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. William H. Murray it is ordered that Guy H. Sigler, Esquire, of Ardmore, and Hudson E. Norvell, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

594 The Ohio River Contract Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Honorable Thomas R. Gordon, Judge Jefferson Circuit Court. The motion for a restraining order and for rule to show cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. C. Heaver and Mr. A. E. Richards of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in support of the same, and Mr. Matthew O'Doherty of counsel for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

700 Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, William J. McWhirt. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Palmer Henry Cullen of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Elliott H. Jones of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The Chesapeake & Ohio
Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John W. Shaw

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. L. Worthington, Mr. W. D. Cochran, and Mr. Le Wright Browning of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Allan D. Cole, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The St. Joseph & Grand
Island Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ralph W. Moore

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert A. Brown, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John C. Parkinson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Marion McAllister, as
Administratrix, &c.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Chesapeake & Ohio
Railway Co. et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Allan D. Cole, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. E. L. Worthington, Mr. W. D. Cochran, and Mr. Le Wright Browning of counsel for the defendants in error.

Mountain Timber Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Washington

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. J.

counsel for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. W. V. Tanner, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Preston M. Troy, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

165 August Day, vs. (Plaintiffs in Error, Merrill & Ring Logging Co. S. J. McCluskey, Administrator, etc., 166 vs. (Plaintiffs in Error, Marysville & Northern Railway Co. et al.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John T. Casey, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 31st, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

(Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Homer J. Dixon, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney M. Ballou, it is ordered that Leslie P. Scott, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday January 3rd 1877 continued

153 Henry D. McDonald vs. (Plaintiff in Error) J. H. Mabee

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry D. McDonald pro se and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the defendant in error.

165 August Gray vs. (Plaintiff in Error) Merrill & King Assignees &c.

166 T. J. McCluskey Administrator &c. vs. (Plaintiff in Error) Marysville & Benicia Railway Co. et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. John T. Carey of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. E. C. Hughes of counsel for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. John T. Carey of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

156 William Raymond vs. (Plaintiff in Error) Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. John W. Cary of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. [illegible] H. Field, of counsel for the defendant in error.

280 Southern Pacific Co.
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
Minnie Jensen.

281 Clyde Steamship Co.,
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
William Alfred Walker.

It is ordered by the Court that four hours be allowed for the argument of these cases.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Norman B. Beecher, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken, of counsel for the defendants in error

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Thursday, February 1st, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. P. Holladay, it is ordered that Robert Spence, Esquire, of Newport, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, it is ordered that Giles Chapin, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.

[illegible] Watkin, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], it is ordered that H. S. Halbert, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and Hon. [illegible] McMillen, Esquire, of Decatur, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Doyle Carmody, it is ordered that Frank L. Hall, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

[illegible],
vs. Petitioner,
Otto [illegible], Sheriff &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. [illegible] L. Carey in support of the same.

175	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Annie Rodgers, as Administratrix of the Estate of James Rodgers, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

172	J. D. Bancroft, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Ada Burhans Smith, Administratrix, &c.	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr.

Charles F. Hutchings and Mr. McCants Stewart, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Joseph Taggart, of counsel for the defendant in error.

280	Southern Pacific Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Marie Jensen.	The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken, of counsel for the New York State
281	Clyde Steamship Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, [illegible]	

in error, and concluded by Mr. Norman B. Beecher, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. Leave was granted Mr. Norman B. Beecher to file additional authorities, and to Mr. E. Clarence Aiken to file reply authorities.

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.,
320 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sarah White;
The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.
321 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
James Winfield.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frank V. Whiting, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Robert E. Whalen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Erie Railroad Co.,
366 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary L. Winfield.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George S. Hobart, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Harry Lane, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, February 2d, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Charles E. Morrow, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that George M. Carter, Esquire, of Lake Andes, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Friday, February 2d, 1917, continued

255 Erie Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, v. Harry L. Winfield. The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Henry Lowe, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Gilbert Collins, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

149 The United States, Petr., v. The M. H. Pulaski Co., et al.
150 The United States, Petr., v. H. W. Henry Co., et al.
151 The United States, Petr., v. James Elliott & Co., et al.
152 The United States, Petr., v. J. Wile Sons & Co.
153 The United States, Petr., v. Robert Muller & Co.
154 The United States, Petr., v. Wood & Selick, et al.
155 The United States, Petr., v. E. La Montagne's Sons.
156 The United States, Petr., v. Albert Lorsch & Co., et al.
157 The United States, Petr., v. Cullman Brothers, et al.
158 The United States, Petr., v. G. W. Faber, Inc.
159 The United States, Petr., v. Louis Meyers & Son.
160 The United States, Petr., v. William Openhym & Sons, et al.
161 The United States, Petr., v. Park & Tilford.
162 The United States, Petr., v. [illegible] & Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann and Mr. James M. Beck, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner.

119	Allen Bond et al. vs. J. L. Hume	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Pope Cook of counsel for Allen Bond et al. No appearance was entered for J. L. Hume.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, February 5th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence B. Cohen, it is ordered that Samuel Stintz, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, it is ordered that William B. Ogden, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. W. D. McNellan, it is ordered that W. A. Woods, Esquire, of Charleston, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler, it is ordered that David Cosgrave, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Houston B. Teehee, it is ordered that E. L. Mitchell, Esquire, of Claremore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that James Harrison Power, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, it is ordered that Harry J. Hanly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, February 5th, 1917 continued

130

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

391

The Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The First National Bank of Hillsboro, Ohio.

In Error to the Cincinnati Superior Court, State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Cincinnati Superior Court, State of Ohio and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Day.

698	Great Northern Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Anna Roach, as Administratrix of the Estate of Thomas Roach, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Original	Ex parte: In the matter of Joseph Marshall, Petitioner.	On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein;

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Original	Ex parte: In the matter of Joseph P. White, as President, and William Green, as Secretary-Treasurer of United Mine Workers of America, et al. Petitioners.	On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and

denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

728 Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mary O'Connor, as Administratrix of the Estate of Frank J. O'Connor, deceased.

On consideration of the motion to enlarge the time for defendant in error to file designation of additional parts of the record to be printed, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] The United States vs. Appellant, Daniel J. Lacy and George Lacy, Administrators of James D. Lacy, deceased, Luther Laflin Kellogg and The Norfolk & Western Railway Co.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss this appeal, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Charles A. Mason and A. Hanson, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

724 Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States ex rel.
The Fowler Car Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

741 The United States
vs.
Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

774 Mrs. Rose Engster,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
King County, Washington, and The State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

St. Louis Merchants' Bridge Terminal Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. William J. Schuermann. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

692

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State Bank of Chambers, Nebraska, Petitioner, vs. J. D. [illegible], Trustee &c. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

[illegible]

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

886	Illinois Central Rail-road Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. W. S. Messer	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

888	United Mine Workers of America, Petitioners, vs. A. S. Dowd, Receiver of Coronado Coal Co., et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

888 Samuel Brandon, vs. Petitioner
The United States

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

884 Eva Ward, vs. Petitioner,
Otto S. Langum, Sheriff of Hennepin County, Minnesota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

592	The Ohio River Contract Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Honorable Thomas R. Gordon, Judge Jefferson Circuit Court	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky

The application for a restraining order pending the disposal of the cause on this writ of error is granted. It is therefore ordered that the defendant in error Honorable Thomas R. Gordon, Judge of the Jefferson Circuit Court, Common Pleas Branch, Second Division, is hereby restrained and prohibited from further proceeding with the action at law now pending before him as Judge of said court wherein John J. Hanna is plaintiff and The Ohio River Contract Company and Albert Swisher are defendants, until the further order of this court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

2 Original	Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. State of West Virginia	On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus

herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commonwealth of Virginia,
2 Original vs. Complainant,
State of West Virginia,
Honorable Wells Goodykoontz,
et al., Senators of the State of
West Virginia; Honorable
Joseph S. Thurmond, et al.,
Members of the House of
Delegates of the State of
West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition of the Commonwealth of Virginia, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by Honorable Wells Goodykoontz, President of the Senate; Honorables Benj. L. Rosenbloom, Elmer Hough, W. H. Coulter, W. F. Burgess, Robert L. Gregory, M. R. Doty, Warren Miller, Raymond Dodson, W. S. McHenry, J. E. Frazier, J. W. Luther, W. S. Hawley, C. C. Coulter, Martin V. Godbey, A. R. Montgomery, Guy Hagy, H. G. Vencill, E. H. Morton, Fred L. Fox, Scott C. Lowe, Charles A. Sinsel, Roy C. Parrish, Wallace B. Gribble, Richard E. Talbott, John C. Arnold, S. C. Billings, S. L. Coburn, Frank Wentworth, G. R. Kump, Senators of the State of West Virginia; Honorable Joseph S. Thurmond, Speaker of the House of Delegates, Honorables Clyde Siling, Harry S. Hensham, John N. Parks, Luther R. Jones, Lee Kinder, L. F. Harvey, T. J. Mahan, W. C. H. Hamilton, John L. Conrad, A. J. Baxter, R. T. Coley, Russell Lester, Paul Hardman, A. R. Henning, J. Alfred Taylor, Charles J. Mason, George W. Sidebottom, J. Wilbur Davis, E. E. Cottrell, F. H. Dixon, A. B. C. Bray, W. W. Carder, J. Roy Parker, J. D. Whipkey, S. R. Harrison, Jr., Ernest Coates, Everett Hughes, Wilson Dunn, L. V. Koontz, J. F. Brumbaugh, Hagan, W. W. McDonald, John Patrick, C. F. Payne, A. W. Price, James Bassel, Charles Cabell, Robert Kincaid, Ira R. Rice, Frank C. Haymond, E. C. Ramsey, C. H. Hunter, George W. Bynum, [illegible] M. Wilson, W. D. Curry, R. B. Ferguson, W. B. Horatio, A. F. Dorsey, S. A. Moore, Joseph B. Stratton, William S. John, Perry C. McBride, Clarence Bynum, W. H. Sines, Harry Hagerman, E. Howard Harper, J. Buell Snyder, Floyd Waldron, W. G. Conner, J. C. Eversley, W. T. Otte, Harry A. Weiss, A. Green Blackstone, J. A. Hines, Gilbert D. Smith, B. M. Yeager, W. H. Glover, Lewy Shaw, C. W. Taylor, C. L. Humbertson, P. C. Sullivan, E. H. Arnold, James W. Weir, B. R. Ferguson, A. M. Horseman, C. T. Summers, S. A. Riddlebarger, J. Sidney Burdett, H. R. Moore, F. H. Hartman, John B. Hilleary, W. A. Ferguson, F. W. Terrill, W. T. Talbott, Septimus Hall, J. Frank Alley, S. F. Wells, W. D. Rice, T. F. Wells, John D. Sweeney, and A. J. Mullens, Members of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Tuesday, March 6th, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon of that day, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why a writ of mandamus should not issue against them as prayed in said petition.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Original The People of the State of New York, Complainant, vs. State of New Jersey et al.

The motion to set this cause for argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. J. O'Sullivan, of counsel for the complainant, in support thereof, and Mr. John W. Wescott, Mr. Robert H. McCarter, and Mr. Adrian Riker of counsel for the defendants in opposition thereto.

450 Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of America, Petitioner, vs. Emil J. Simon

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James R. Sheffield and Mr. John W. Griggs, of counsel for the petitioner in support thereof, and Mr. Walter H. Pumphrey, of counsel for the respondent in opposition thereto.

860 Detroit Rock Salt Co., Petitioner, vs. Swift & Company

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. B. Corliss and Mr. Samuel B. Moody in support thereof, and Mr. William L. Carpenter in opposition thereto.

897 Jacob S. Hayden, Petitioner, vs. Ellen C. Dunn et al., Executrix, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. T. Stambaugh and Mr. John M. Sherman in support of the same, and Mr. Charles McLernan, Mr. James Morgan Clarke, Mr. Melvin C. Sperry and Mr. George M. Hoffheimer in opposition thereto.

838 Mrs. M. S. Jennings et al., Petitioners, vs. L. P. Smith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edgar T. Brackett and Mr. John J. Strickland in support of the same, and Mr. R. H. Libbey, Mr. Alex. C. King, Mr. H. M. Holden, Mr. Hamilton McWhorter and Mr. E. T. Hook in opposition thereto.

9.6 H. S. Howard Co., Petitioner, vs. The Baldwin Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel S. Watson in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto within ten days.

787 Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co. et al.,
vs.
The Arctic Iron Co.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. C. Dustin, Mr. W. P. Belden and Mr. Horace Andrews of counsel for the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company et al., in support of the same, and Mr. S. H. Shantl of counsel for The Arctic Iron Company in opposition thereto.

788 Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co. et al.
vs.
The Arctic Iron Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the entire record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Shantl of counsel for The Arctic Iron Company in support of the same, and Mr. A. C. Dustin, Mr. W. P. Belden, and Mr. Horace Andrews of counsel for the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company et al., in opposition thereto.

844 Illinois Wyoming Petroleum Co., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Wm. P. Valentine et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry E. Kelly in support of the same.

236

Southern Surety Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Board of County
Commissioners of Okla-
homa County, etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. C. J. Kappler in support of the same.

868

Boston Store of Chicago
vs.
American Graphophone Co.
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hamilton Moses, Mr. Joseph W. Moses, and Mr. Walter Bachrach in support of the same, and Mr. Elisha K. Camp and Mr. Taylor E. Brown in opposition thereto.

881

Samuel S. Chamberlain,
Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
John B. Billings.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William J. Lunsin Jr. in support of the same, and Mr. [illegible] L. Lewis in opposition thereto.

877

The Washington Loan &
Trust Co., Trustee, et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the

Court by Mr. Charles H. Merillat, Mr. Daniel W. O'Donoghue, Mr. Arthur A. Alexander, and Mr. William C. Woodward in support of the same.

696 Hugh C. Macmillan, Petitioner, vs. President Suspender Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. [illegible] in support of the same, and Mr. Odin Roberts in opposition thereto.

697 General Electric Co., Petitioner, vs. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Richmond Mott in support of the same, and Mr. William L. Visscher in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Samuel C. Cohen, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. Elias W. Samuels. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lawrence B. Cohen in support of the same, and Mr. Irving L. Ernst in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned [illegible]

Monday March 5th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court would take a recess for the purpose of attending the inauguration of the President of the United States.

The oath of office was administered to the Honorable Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States by the Chief Justice, and the Court reconvened.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, March 6th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that H. La Rue Brown, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Orville J. Taylor, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Robert L. Henry, Esquire, of Waco, State of Texas; Floyd A. Johnston and Harry T. McDonnan, Esquires, of Springfield, State of Ohio; John W. Lapham, Esquire, of Columbus, and R. E. Coughlin, Esquire, of Paola, State of Kansas, and George Selden Wallace, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn ac-

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Gutherie, it is ordered that Horace L. Bomar, Esquire, of Spartanburg, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Albert H. Vestal, Esquire, of Anderson, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury, it is ordered that Raynal C. Bolling and Kenneth W. Halstead Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that S. G. Heath, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Scott Thompson, it is ordered that John G. Lyons, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri and Samuel Edwin Fullerton, Esquire, of tice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Wayland, it is ordered that Whitaker Vest Draffen, Esquire, of Boonville, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter F. Dunne, it is ordered that Frank C. Cleary and James W. Ryan, Esquires, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Mahan, it is ordered that Guy A. Thompson, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, it is ordered that Edward Rice, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, George Palmer Garrett, Esquire, of Kissimmee, State of Florida, and Fred P. Branson, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to

Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Cupane, it is ordered that Louis Titus, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. D. Church, it is ordered that Irving Upson Townsend, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ramsey, it is ordered that Maurice L. Heide, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Mecartney, it is ordered that Sherman C. Spitzer and Martin J. Isaacs, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

John M. Harrington, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that D. S. Hargraves, Esquire, of Forrest City, State of Arkansas, and Clarence H. Fisher, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that C. Henry Cohen, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis it is ordered that Chester De Witt Pugsley, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft it is ordered that Clyde Scott Stilwell, Lester L. Falk and William Rothmann, Esquires, of Chicago, and George

be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Murray Hulbert, it is ordered that William Tuite Kelahan and Francis Stephen McAvoy, Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Daniels, it is ordered that Lawrence Koenigsberger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Russell, it is ordered that James T. Lloyd, Junior, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ottamar Hamele, it is ordered that Philo B. Sands, Esquire, of Clermont, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that William S. Metz Esquire of Sheridan, State of Wyoming be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Doremus, it is ordered that Maurice E. FitzGerald, Thomas J. Bresnahan, Louis J. Colombo, Andrew C. Baird and Thomas L. Dalton, Esquires of Detroit, and John E. Kinnane, Esquire, of Bay City, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Frank C. Smith, Esquire, of East St. Louis, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Olaf Fiske, Master of the Norwegian Steamship "Selja," &c., Petitioner, vs. San Francisco & Portland Steamship Co., Claimant of the American Steamship "Beaver"	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

625

Memphis Street Railway Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
S. C. Moore, Administrator of the Estate of Roy B. Douglas, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee.

78 Marion McAllister, as Administratrix of the Estate of A. J. McAllister, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. and The Maysville & Big Sandy Railway Co.	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Clarke

178 The St. Joseph & Grand Island Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ralph W. Moore	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

156

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Robert J. McKibbin.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss for want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

147

Charles C. Pennington,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Fourth National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

this cause was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

160 Chas. Pease, Petitioner, vs. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Co. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

419 Chas. Pease et al., Petitioners, vs. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Co. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

376 Swift & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Hocking Valley Railway Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds

347 Rome Railway & Light Co., Appellant, vs. Floyd County, Georgia, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

338 The New York Central Railroad Co., successor to the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sarah White. — In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department, of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

185 J. C. Hawkins, vs. Appellant, John L. Bleakly, Auditor of the State of Iowa, and Warren Garst, Iowa Industrial Commissioner.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

188 Mountain Timber Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Washington.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds

Werner Horn, Appellant, v. John J. Mitchell, United States Marshal for the District of Massachusetts	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

658

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Grays Harbor Logging Co. and W. E. Boeing, Plaintiffs in Error, v. Coats-Fordney Logging Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

138

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney

[illegible] The Enterprise Irrigation District, The Ramshorn Ditch Co. et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Tri State Land Co. and The Farmers Mutual Canal Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

179 City of Owensboro, Kentucky,
Appellant,
vs.
Owensboro Water Works Co. of Owensboro, Kentucky.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke
Mr. Justice Brandeis
(Mr. Justice Day concurs in the dissent.)

(57) C. E. Gannon, vs. Plaintiff in Error; D. R. Johnston and William Wolfe.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day

(38) Charles H. Baker, Algernon S. Stetson, and Seattle Water Front Realty Co., vs. Appellants, John W. Schofield, as Receiver of the Merchants' National Bank of Seattle.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

per Mr. Justice Day

William R. Staats Co.
and Title Insurance & Trust Co.,
608 vs. Appellants,
Security Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, &c.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Day

Hans Berg (Prize Master in charge of the Prize Ship "Appam," and L. M. von Schilling, Vice Consul of the German Empire, Appellants, vs British & African Steam Navigation Co	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia

650

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day

Hans Berg Prize Master in charge of the Prize Ship "Appam," and L. M. von Schilling, Vice-Consul of the German Empire, Appellants, vs Henry G. Harrison, Master of the Steamship "Appam"	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia

722

This cause came on to be heard, on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the quia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day

555 Henry D. McDonald, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. A. Mabee.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

584 The Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Gold Issue Mining & Milling Co.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Holmes

149 The United States, Petitioner,
vs.
The M. H. Pulaski Co. et al

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Day

156 The United States, Petitioner, vs. R. F. Downing & Co. et al. | On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day.

157 The United States, Petitioner, vs. James Elliott & Co. et al. | On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of

by with the opinion of this Court.
per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

The United States, Petitioner	On writ of certiorari to the
187 vs.	United States Court of
J. Wile Sons & Co	Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.
per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

The United States, Petitioner	On writ of certiorari to the
188 vs.	United States Court of
Robert Muller & Co	Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On considera-by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

The United States,
154 vs. Petitioner,
Wood & Selick, et al

Writ of certiorari to the
United States Court of
Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

155 The United States, Petitioner,
vs.
E. La Montagne's Sons.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day.

156 The United States, Petitioner,
vs.
Albert Lorsch & Co. et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Custom Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day.

157 The United States, Petitioner, vs Cullman Brothers et al.
On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

158 The United States, Petitioner, vs G. W. Fisher, Inc.
On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

toms Appeals and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

The United States,
159 vs. Petitioner
Louis Meyer & Son.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

160 The United States, Petitioner, vs. William Openhym & Sons et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day.

161 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Park & Tilford. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Day

163 The United States, Petitioner vs. Salgner & Company	On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Customs Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Day

The State of New Mexico,
20, Original vs. Complainant,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary
of the Interior of the United
States, and Clay Tallman,
Commissioner of the General
Land Office of the United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and a motion of defendants to dismiss the same which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Martin E. Donahue,
225 vs. Rancliffe Evans,
Benjamin Vasper, Fred. H.
Abbott, Maurice J. Jenkin,
and The Buffalo Iron
Mining Co.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and

Hugo Adalberto Thomann,
Gustave A. Frederson,
Heinrich Johannes Riedel
and Eduard H. Müller,
composing the firm of
Thomann & Company,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Sr. Charles W. Cuyper,
Charles W. Cuyper, Jr., Ane
and R. J. Cuyper et al., com
posing the firm of Cuyper,
Fennar & Company, &c.

In Error to the
United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

511	Louise A. Tyrrell, as Administratrix of the Estate of Conrad E. Tyrrell, deceased, Petitioner, vs. The District of Columbia.	On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

544	Wellsville Oil Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Martha Miller née Everett, and Alpha Oil Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Allen Bond and William J. Butterfield, partners as Bond & Butterfield,
119 vs.
J. L. Hume

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union National Bank and Claud Gatch, substituted for H. N. Morris, as Receiver of said Union National Bank,
163 vs. Plaintiffs in Error
George McBoyle and Lulu May McBoyle

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

172.	J. D. Bowersock, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Ada Burham Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Sumner L. Smith, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

166.	P. J. McCluskey, Administrator of Gunder Nordgaard, deceased, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Marysville & Northern Railway Co. and Jamison Mill Co.	In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

168 August Bay, Plaintiff in Error, v. Merrill & Ring Logging Co. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

636

William Raymond,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
Chicago, Milwaukee &
St. Paul Railway Co.

In Error to the United
States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

21 Original.

Ex parte: In the matter
of Bernard B. Selling
et al., a Special Committee
appointed by the Associa-
tion of the Bar of the City
of Detroit,
Petitioners.

On consideration of
the petition for the
disbarment of George
W. Radford, of the
return to the rule to
show cause heretofore
issued, and of the
argument of counsel

thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby granted the respondent, conforming himself to the propositions stated in the opinion of the Court this day delivered, the State Court within thirty days from this date, with permission, by printed brief, considering the record intrinsically to point out any ground within the limitations stated in said opinion which would prevent this Court from giving effect to the conclusions established by the action of the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan which is now before this Court as part of the petition under consideration.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7 Original

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Colorado et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Original

Ex parte: In the matter of Emmett Winters, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

5, Original.	The People of the State of New York, Complainant, vs. The State of New Jersey et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 9th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

485	Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of America, Petitioner, vs. Emil J. Simon	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause; It is now here ordered by the Court

that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

781	Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. et al., vs. The Arctic Iron Co.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause; It is now here ordered by the Court that

said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

787	Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. and William G. Mather vs. The Arctic Iron Co.	On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause, It

is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

863 Boston Store of Chicago vs. American Graphophone Co. and Columbia Graphophone Co. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

852 A. L. Cohn, Petitioner, vs. E. A. Malone, Trustee of A. L. Cohn, Bankrupt. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

858 Samuel C. Cohen, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Elias W. Samuels, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Elias W. Samuels. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of cer-of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

856 Mrs. M. S. Jennings et al., Petitioners, vs. L. P. Smith et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

865 Detroit Rock Salt Co., Petitioner, vs. Swift & Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court

denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

877 The Washington Loan & Trust Co., Trustee, et al., Petitioners, v. Arthur E. Randle. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

881 Samuel S. Chamberlain, Trustee of the Mullings Clothing Co., Petitioner, vs. John B. Mullings. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

896 Hugh G. McWilliams, Petitioner, vs. President Suspender Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

899 Jacob S. Hayden, Petitioner, vs. Ellen G. Davis and Cornelia W. Bassel, Executrices of the last will and testament of John Bassel, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

922 Cassel Electric Co., Petitioner, vs. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

926 R. S. Howard Co., Petitioner, vs. The Baldwin Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

967	Mines Wyoming Petroleum Co. and Great Dome Oil Co., Petitioners, vs. M. L. Valentine et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

38	Eliot A. de Pass, Charles E. de Mercado, and Benjamin Ortiz, as Surviving Partners of the old firm of A. S. Lascelles & Co., Appellants, vs. The United States.	Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

281 Southern Surety Co.
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County, composed of George W. Gannine, C. H. Randall, and F. W. Latimer

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

285 The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John B. Shaw

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Minnesota,
Complainant,
26, Original. vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the defendant, leave is hereby granted to file motion to dismiss in this cause.

Timothy Healy,
Appellant,
577 vs.
Samuel W. Backus,
as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, and he having filed a confession of error and motion that the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this cause be reversed; Therefore in pursuance of said confession and motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

603 Henry T. Marshall, Petitioner, vs. Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, and he having filed a confession of error and motion that the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this cause be reversed, Therefore in pursuance of said confession and motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] The United States et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Central Railroad Co.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court

that this cause be and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next,

807
W. H. Smith,
vs. Appellant,
Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

[illegible]
The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian of the Omaha Tribe of Indians &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
Hiram Chase.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

870
William E. Peck & Co., Inc.,
vs. ([illegible])
John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector &c.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

96[illegible]
E. J. Lynch, Collector, &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
Henry Hornby &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

965 E. J. Lynch, Collector, &c., Petitioner, vs. H. C. Hornby. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

598 Eugenio Kibayer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to submit this cause per stipulation of counsel, and the same was thereupon submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry W. Van Dyke and Mr. Burton W. Gilbert, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the defendant in error.

881 J. H. Herndon et al., Petitioners, vs. T. S. Sloan et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben B. Cain and Mr. Cone Johnson in support of the same.

962 Georgia Coast & Piedmont Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submit-

ation of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry V. Poor, Mr. Robert M. Hitch, and Mr. Samuel B. Adams in support of the same, and Mr. Allen C. King, Mr. Max Isaac, Mr. C. Henry Cohen and Mr. J. J. Spalding in opposition thereto.

Francesco Massari Zavaglia,
226 Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Emmanuelas Nicolaides

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. B. Spencer and Mr. Charles Payne Fenner in support of the same, and Mr. Hannis Taylor, Mr. Henry L. Lazarus, Mr. Arnault Fenner and Mr. David Sessler in opposition thereto.

North German Lloyd,
Claimant, &c.,
992 Petitioner,
vs.
Guaranty Trust Co. of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph Larocque and Mr. Walter C. Noyes in support of the same, and Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, Mr. Charles R. Hickox, Mr. Edmund G. Blodgett, and Mr. James M. Beck in opposition thereto.

923 Helen Van [illegible] et al., Petitioners, vs. Ralph Wolff, Receiver, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. M. L. Meade and Mr. Samuel S. Goldman in support of the same, and Mr. John B. Stanchfield in opposition thereto

940 Paul A. Ewert, Petitioner, vs. C. W. Bean

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court ~~on printed arguments~~ by Mr. Henry C. Lane and Mr. Paul A. Ewert in support of the same, ~~and Mr. W. H. [illegible] in opposition thereto~~

932 Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Ernest H. [illegible] et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank L. Littleton and Mr. George B. Gillespie in support of the same, and Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne in opposition thereto

Tuesday, March 6th, 1917 continued

873 Thomas W. Sheridan, Petitioner, vs The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James W. Ryan and Mr. John L. McNeil in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. [illegible] Brown in opposition thereto.

922 American Bank Note Co., Petitioner, vs Blue Ridge Electric Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry A. Alexander in support of the same and Mr. Robert C. Alston in opposition thereto.

831 Ramon Pastor Diaz, Plaintiff in Error, vs The People of Porto Rico

832 Luis Abella et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs The People of Porto Rico

The motions to dismiss or affirm in these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. S. T. Ansell in support of the same and Mr. R. H. Todd in opposition thereto.

The Toledo Railways & Light Co.
208 vs. (Plaintiff in Error,)
Walter L. Hill et al.
Cross-tion &c.

The motion to amend the record in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Howard S. Gans and Mr. Paul M. Herzog in support of the same, and Mr. Charles A. Frueauff in opposition thereto.

Mergenthaler Linotype Co.,
958 vs. Petitioner,
International Typesetting Machine Co. et al.
Mergenthaler Linotype Co.,
959 vs. Petitioner,
Intertype Corporation

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic P. McKenney and Mr. Robert Fletcher Rogers in support of the same, and Mr. Edmund Wetmore in opposition thereto.

The State of Georgia,
Original vs. Complainant,
The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway et al.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William A. Wimbish in support of the same, and Mr. Edward Colston and Mr. George Hoadly in opposition thereto.

Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway,
466 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ivy Henry
Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway,
467 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George Brown

The motions to dismiss or affirm in these cases or to place the cases on the summary docket were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Samuel A. Anderson in support of the same.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Co.,
768 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Margaret L. Taber,
Guardian, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John T. Wayland in support of the same, and Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. Thomas Hackney and Mr. Martin Lyons in opposition thereto.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. et al.
782 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Minneapolis Civic & Commerce Association

The motion for a rule to show cause and for a writ of supersedeas in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James B. Sheean, Mr. George W. Peterson, Mr. F. W. Root, Mr. C. H. Dunn and Mr. W. H. Bremner in support

Frank J. Manley in opposition thereto.

558 Interboro Brewing Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Standard Brewery Co.
of Baltimore City.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Ramsey and Mr. Warren H. Small in support of the same.

656 Glasgow Navigation Co.,
Limited,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Munson Steamship
Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. Charles R. Hickox in support of the same, and Mr. John M. Griffin in opposition thereto.

10 Original. The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,
vs.
North Carolina.

Mr. Thomas Sterling, in behalf of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for the appointment of a referee in this cause.

Chicago Great Western
Railroad Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submit-tion of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Everall and Mr. Asa G. Briggs in support of the same, and Mr. Harlan E. Leach in opposition thereto.

826

Washington Railway & Electric Co.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Ann Katherine Dade,
Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John S. Barbour, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same, and Mr. D. W. O'Donoghue and Mr. Arthur A. Alexander, of counsel for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

949

William Cramp & Sons
Ship & Engine Building Co.,
vs. Petitioner
International Curtis Marine
Turbine Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Clifton V. Edwards and Mr. Abraham M. Beitler in support of the same, and Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. William G. McKnight in opposition thereto.

938

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. et al.
vs. Petitioners,
A. C. Leach.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Gibson and Mr. William W. Crawford in support of the so—

462 American Express Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of South Dakota
ex rel. Clarence C. Caldwell,
Attorney General, etc.

Mr. T. B. Harrison of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Ex parte: In the matter
of Louis Prima,
Original. Petitioner.

Mr. George E. Sullivan of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

997 Hendersonville Light &
Power Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Blue Ridge Interurban
Railway Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or place the same on the summary docket, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record, and printed arguments by Mr. H. L. Bemar, Mr. Charles W. Tillett, and Mr. Thomas C. Guthrie in support of the same, and Mr. Julius C. Martin, Mr. T. S. Rollins and Mr. George H. Wright in opposition thereto.

231
Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Warley.

On motion of Mr. S. S. Field in that behalf, leave is hereby granted the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

Original
Ex parte: In the matter of Edgar F. Hathaway et al., Petitioners.

Mr. Charles D. Lanning, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

957
Winfield S. Pendleton, Petitioner,
vs.
American Warehouse & Trading Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Barry F. Cushman in support of the same, and Mr. John W. Griffin and Mr. Frank Harvey Field in opposition thereto.

963
Lee Line Steamers, Petitioner,
vs.
Atlas Transportation Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Gary M. Thompson and Mr. John F. [illegible] in support of the same

Mobile in opposition thereto.

1014 The Ohio River Contract Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas R. Gordon, Judge, &c.

The motions to advance this cause and to transfer the cause to the summary docket were submitted to the considera-tion of the Court by Mr. W. Overton Harris and Mr. A. E. Richards of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

772 R. B. Simpson, as Trustee, &c., Petitioner, vs. Thomas W. Brent, et al., as Executors, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William H. Watson in support of the same, and Mr. W. A. Blount, Mr. A. C. Blount and Mr. F. B. Carter in opposition thereto.

937 Mary E. Evans et al., Petitioners, vs. W. H. Hand, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. E. Thomas in support of the same.

John H. Van Dyke et al., Appellants, vs.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of

pellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to restore this case to the call.

894 G. Washington Lott, Appellant, vs. David W. Pittman, Sheriff &c. — Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, on behalf of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

920 C. W. Williams, Petitioner, vs. Home Insurance Co. of New York. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander C. Birch in support of the same, and Mr. Benjamin P. Crum in opposition thereto.

866 Charles Jerome Edwards, Petitioner, vs. Henry P. Keith, Collector of Internal Revenue &c. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Meier Steinbrink in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

868 Theodore B. Rowe et al. Petitioners, vs. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein

consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Meier Steinbrink in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

Nat Jarrett, Jr., Coal Co.
et al.,
991 vs. Petitioners,
United Thacker Coal Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court, on printed arguments by Mr. John H. Holt and Mr. E. Spencer Miller in support of the same, and Mr. Malcolm Jackson in opposition thereto.

Illinois Central Rail-
road Co. et al.,
985 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
L. A. Anderson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Blewett Lee, Mr. Robert V. Fletcher and Mr. Robert B. Mayes, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same, and Mr. Julian C. Wilson and Mr. W. P. Bramlett, of counsel for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Prairie Oil & Gas Co. et al.,
1047 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Minnie Carter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-

Joseph W. Bailey, and Mr. George E. Kenning ~~and Mr.~~ William Martin of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same, and Mr. S. W. Moyer of counsel for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

958	Arthur A. Bonvillain, Petitioner, vs. H. B. Howell, Trustee &c.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. Généres Dufour in support of the same, and Mr. E. A. O'Sullivan in opposition thereto.

56	International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.	On motion of Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft in that behalf leave is hereby granted Mr. Frank B. Kellogg to

withdraw his appearance as counsel for the appellants in this cause.

238	The Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. F. Duggan.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance judged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

287

Duncan L. Thompson, Auditor of Public Accounts of the State of Mississippi, and Ross A. Collins, Attorney General of the State of Mississippi,
Appellants,
vs.
Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a joint motion of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed at the costs of the appellee.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

288

Duncan L. Thompson, Auditor of Public Accounts of the State of Mississippi, and Ross A. Collins, Attorney General of the State of Mississippi,
Appellants,
vs.
Southern Railway Co. in Mississippi.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed at the costs of the appellee.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

349

National Loan & Exchange
Bank of Greenwood et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Adolphus W. Jones et al.,
constituting the South Carolina Tax Commission, et al.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of South
Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

350

The Peoples National
Bank of Greenville,
South Carolina,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
A. W. Jones et al. Commissioners, etc.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of South
Carolina.

counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

642 The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Greenbrier Distillery Co. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

2 Original. Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. State of West Virginia. — Mr. John H. Holt, of counsel for the defendant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to discharge the rule to show cause herein, and leave was granted counsel for the complainant to file brief within ten days and to counsel for the defendant to file

56. International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, four hours were allowed each side in the reargument of this cause.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, March 7th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by the Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that B. Franklin Pepper, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Constantine J. Smyth, it is ordered that Frank E. Murphy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. L. T. Michener, it is ordered that Dick T. Morgan, Esquire, of Woodward, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Eason it is ordered that John E. Cross, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, it is ordered that Carlos Gray, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Nelson, it is ordered that Henry E. McKenna, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Wilson it is ordered that Albert Pope, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-

Wednesday, March 7th, 1917, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, it is ordered that Burton Francis Peek, Esquire, of Moline, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey it is ordered that Irvin W. DeKay, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burgess W. Marshall, it is ordered that Arthur F. McCarty, Esquire, of Salina, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Edward H. Randolph, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Terry,
806 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Kansas.

Mr. W. H. Thompson, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this case.

Ida A. Van Dyke et al.,
57 vs. Appellants,
W. Paul Geary et al., Members of the Corporation Commission of Arizona, et al.

On motion of Mr. William C. Prentiss, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that the motion to restore this case to the call be, and the same is hereby, withdrawn.

International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al.,
56 vs. Appellants,
The United States.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft of counsel for the appellants, by Mr. Attorney General Gregory and Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. John P. Wilson of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, March 8th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Clement B. Donworth, Esquire, of Machias, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Bunn, it is ordered that Leo Kennedy, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be

William Langer, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury that William C. Gebhardt, Esquire, of Clinton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that Lee C. Bradley, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Bartell, it is ordered that Donald R. Wegg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. K. D. McKellar, it is ordered that William D. Kyser, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accor

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that William B. Crutch, Esquire, of Artesia, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al.
492. vs
The United States.

Mr. P. F. Dunne, of counsel for Stephen T. Gage, one of the parties in this cause, individually and as Trustee, suggested the death of the said Stephen T. Gage, and moved the Court to make the Oakland Savings Bank, as executor of the last will and testament of the said Stephen T. Gage, deceased, and Charles H. Redwood, successor to the said Stephen T. Gage as Trustee, parties herein in the place of the said Stephen T. Gage, deceased. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the Oakland Savings Bank, as Executor of Stephen T. Gage, deceased, and Charles H. Redwood, substituted Trustee, be, and they are hereby, made parties in this cause in place of the said Stephen T. Gage, deceased.

International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al.
56. vs Appellants
The United States.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. John P. Wilson of counsel for the ap

492

Oregon & California
Railroad Co., et al.
vs
The United States

On motion of Mr. Francis J. Heney it is ordered that leave is hereby granted him to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

492

Oregon & California
Railroad Co. et al.
vs.
The United States

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. P. F. Dunne, of counsel for the Oregon & California Railroad Company et al., and continued by Mr. Constantine J. Smyth, of counsel for The United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Friday, March 9th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Guy W. Curts, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Constantine J. Smyth, it is ordered that Robert C. Stewart, Esquire, of Deadwood, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

736	City and County of Denver et al., Appellants, vs. The Denver Union Water Co.	Mr. C. E. [illegible], on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.
737	The Denver Union Water Co., Appellant, vs. City and County of Denver et al.	

469 Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al.
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Constantine J. Smyth, of counsel for The United States, and concluded by Mr. Percy D. Trafford, of counsel for the Union Trust Company.

481 The United States of America,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States Steel Corporation et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, six hours were allowed each side in the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. R. V. Lindabury, of counsel for the appellees.

Monday next at 12 o'c

Monday, March 12th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Van Sant, it is ordered that Henry B. Wesselman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King it is ordered that Armand Offutt, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury it is ordered that

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Wickliffe Jones, it is ordered that Edmund C. Hanford, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. W. B. Kinkaid, it is ordered that Malcolm McAvoy, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

84 The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. R. Cross.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

from Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the con-

6 The United States, Plaintiff in Error vs. Achilles Kelly, Minor &c. Kelly, Lilliam Kelly, Minor &c. et al.	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr Justice Pitney

(Mr Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

44 Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ivy Henry	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and five per cent.

467	Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway vs. Plaintiff in Error, George Banks	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and five per cent. damages.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

381	Ramon Castro Diaz vs. Plaintiff in Error, The People of Porto Rico	In Error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Juan Abella and Pedro G. Goico, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The People of Porto Rico — In Error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico. [illegible]

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. Trustees of Cincinnati Southern Railway et al. — Argued — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendants returnable on the first day of the next term of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Pierre Primus, Petitioner. — Submitted — On consideration of the motion for leave to file the petition for writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that

per Mr. Chief Justice [illegible]

11, Original. The State of South Dakota, Complainant, vs. Charles B. Collins

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of William Walker to take and return the evidence on the part of the complainant and defendant in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

588. The Toledo Railways & Light Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Walter L. Hill et al., Executors, &c.

On consideration of the motion to amend the transcript of record herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

806. William Terry, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari herein on suggestion of diminution of the record, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

198 The Ohio River Contract Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Honorable Thomas R. Gordon,
Judge of Jefferson Circuit
Court.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

160 The Missouri Pacific
Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Margaret L. Fisher, Guardian of Harry H. Small,
Grace L. Small and Margaret E. Small, minors

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

192 William E. Peck & Co.,
Incorporated,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector
of Internal Revenue, Second
District of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

148 L. Washington Lott,
vs. Appellant,
David H. Pittman,

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It-by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

American Express Co.,
George C. Taylor individually and as President of the American Express Co., and Wells Fargo & Co.,
903 vs. Plaintiffs in Error
The State of South Dakota ex rel. Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General of the State of South Dakota, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian of the Omaha Tribe of Indians, etc.,
1197 vs. Petitioner
Hiram Chase

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2nd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

107 M. H. Smith,
vs. Appellant,
Interstate Commerce
Commission.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

136 City and County of
Denver et al.
vs. Appellants,
Denver Union Water Co.

781 Denver Union Water Co.
vs. Appellant,
City and County of
Denver et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

148 Theodore S. Rosen and
Abraham Wagner,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court gument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

919 William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., Petitioner,
vs.
International Curtis Marine Turbine Co. and Curtis Marine Turbine Co. of The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

North German Lloyd, Claimant of the Steamship "Kronprinzessin Cecilie,"
922 Petitioner,
vs.
Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, and National City Bank of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

rari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Prairie Oil & Gas Co., Ernie W. Anthony and Charles H. Anthony, Plaintiffs in Error, vs Annie Cooke.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Charles Jerome Edwards, Petitioner, vs Henry P. Keith as Collector of Internal Revenue, First District, State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as

Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

873. Thomas R. Sheridan, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

891 J. H. Herndon, Mrs. M. L. Herndon, J. M. Herndon et al., Petitioners, vs. T. S. Sloan et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. B. Simpson, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of [illegible], a Bankrupt, Petitioner,
[illegible] vs.
Thomas W. Brent et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

A. H. Williams, Petitioner,
[illegible] vs.
The Home Insurance Co of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

652 Frank W. Tillinghast et al., Appellants, vs. John J. Richards, Marshal, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and Mr. Percy W. Gardner in opposition thereto.

968 John W. Hamm et al., Appellants, vs. New York Railways Co. et al.

Mr. John W. Davis, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

956 Robert H. Quick, Petitioner, vs. Julia G. Stewart et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Malcolm McAvoy and Mr. Rees Lewis in support of the same, and Mr. Oscar W. Kuhn and Mr. Alfred M. Cohen in opposition thereto.

308 Esteban Huertas et al., Appellants, vs. José Vazquez Montes

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the

Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell in support of the same.

575 The Houston Oil Co. of Texas et al., Petitioners, vs. Cornelius G. Goodrich et al. — The motion for rule against the respondents in this cause for contempt of court was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William L. Marbury and Mr. Thomas M. Kennedy in support of the same, and Mr. W. D. Gordon in opposition thereto.

770 Robert A. Woods by his guardian ad litem W. B. Woods, Petitioner, vs. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Boyd Evans in support of the same.

774 W. T. Hutchinson, Judge, &c., Petitioner, vs. Louis Jefferson.
775 W. T. Hutchinson, Judge, &c., Petitioner, vs. Elizabeth Cannon.
776 W. T. Hutchinson, Judge, &c., Petitioner, vs.
— The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Helm Bruce in support of the same, and

977 W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, etc.,
vs. Petitioner,
Mildred E. Hecker

978 W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, etc.,
vs. Petitioner
Sterling Land & Investment Co.

and Mr. W. Clinton Harris of counsel for the respondents in cases Nos. 977 and 978 in opposition thereto.

880 The Toledo Newspaper Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, Mr. C. S. Northup and Mr. Joseph L. Graydon, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in support of the same.

985 John A. Gardner,
vs. Petitioner,
The Western Union Telegraph Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles A. Lewis in support of the same, and Mr. Rush Taggart and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark in opposition thereto.

987 J. Schuler et al., etc.,
vs. Petitioners.
The Manitou Spring Mineral Water Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto.

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co. et al., etc.,
et al.,
800 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. G. Layton.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to transfer the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Marion Smith in support of the same, and Mr. Eugene R. Black, Mr. Saunders McDaniel and Mr. H. C. Peeples in opposition thereto.

The United States of
America,
481 vs. Appellant,
The United States Steel
Corporation et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. R. V. Lindabury of counsel for the appellees, and Mr. Henry E. Colton of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Tuesday, March 13th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Walton Moore, it is ordered that Abraham Philip Hamburg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Connelly, it is ordered that Daniel Lowengrund, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

R. Bingham, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan [illegible], it is ordered that G. Howard Smith, Esquire, of Thief River Falls, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

481 The United States of America, Appellant,
vs.
The United States Steel Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry E. Colton, of counsel for the appellant; Mr. George Welwood Murray, Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. C. A. Severance, of counsel for the appellees, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Wednesday March 14th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol,

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that A. W. La Fleiche, Esquire, of Sheridan, State of Wyoming be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

1181 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The United States Steel Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellant.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1917 continued

475

William McCoach,
Collector of Internal
Revenue,
Petitioner,
vs.
Insurance Company of
North America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. B. F. Pepper, of counsel for the respondent.

685

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Jesse T. Moorhead.

This cause was argued by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. B. Sands, of counsel for the defendant in error.

687

The United States
vs.
Lucky E. Walker et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, of counsel for the United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, March 15th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Stone, it is ordered that Isaac M. Byers, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, it is ordered that Forrest D. Simmons, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that James H. Houston Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

768 First National Bank of Bay City,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Grant Fellows, Attorney General &c.

The Clerk is directed to notify the Attorney General of the United States of the pendency of this case, and leave is granted him to take part in the oral argument if he is so advised.

687 The United States
vs.
Lucky E. Walter et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Marshall A. Spooner, of counsel for Lucky E. Walter et al. and concluded by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, of counsel for The United States.

755 The Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Richard W. Barrett, of counsel for the appellant; continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, of counsel for The United States, and Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Richard W. Barrett, of

461 The United States of America, vs. Solomon Louis Ginsberg

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren of counsel for The United States of America. No appearance was entered for Solomon Louis Ginsberg.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, March 16th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that Charles A. Ludlow, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Foote, it is ordered that Henry C. Attwill, Esquire, of Lynn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

half by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews it is ordered that Daniel N. Kirby, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., it is ordered that Nelson W. Howard, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

649 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Solomon Kinofsky. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

683 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mathew J. Gradwell et al.

684 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles Hambly et al.

These causes were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Alexander L. Churchill and Mr. John W. Cummings, of counsel for the defendants in error.

[illegible] The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edward O'Toole et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John H. Hole, of counsel for the defendants in error.

585 The United States,
vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery
Co. of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. Frank Y. Gladney in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

[illegible] The United States,
vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery
Co. of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. C. J. Smyth, of counsel for the appellees, five hours are allowed each side in the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. H. Le Roy Brown, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday March 19th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter } Associate
Mahlon Pitney } Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank Key Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. Whelan, it is ordered that Michael K. Reilly, Esquire, of Fond du Lac, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. E. Weadock, it is ordered that William A. Bahlke, Esquire, of Alma, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Crane, it is ordered that Peter McPherson, Esquire, of Brewster, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Smith, it is ordered that James A. Cobb, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and W. Ashbie Hawkins, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that James B. Sheehan and Jacob J. Lesser, Esquires of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis, it is ordered that Willey C. Stowell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Monday March 19th, 1917 continued.

Thomas A. Thacher, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Utah Power & Light Co.,
282 vs. Appellant,
The United States
The United States,
283 vs. Appellant,
Utah Power & Light Co.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, save as it denies the right of The United States to compensation for the past occupancy and use of its reserved lands without its permission; and, in that respect, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that said decree be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Beaver River Power Co., [illegible] vs. Appellant, The United States. The United States [illegible] vs. Appellant, The Beaver River Power Co.	Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, save as it denies the right of the United States to compensation for the past occupancy and use of its reserved lands without its permission, and, in that respect, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that said decree be, and the same is hereby reversed. and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

206	Lucien L. Nunn and The Beaver River Power Co. Appellants, vs. The United States.	Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.
207	The United States, Appellant, vs. Lucien L. Nunn and The Beaver River Power Co.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, save as it denies the right of The United States to compensation for the past occupancy and use of its reserved lands without its permission, and, in that respect, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that said decree be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

75 Francis M. Wilson, United States Attorney for the Western District of Missouri, Appellant, vs. Alexander New and Henry C. Ferris, as Receivers of the Missouri, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day;
Mr. Justice Pitney and
Mr. Justice Van Devanter;
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
(Mr. Justice McKenna concurs in the result.)

226

Francesco Mussari Zaraglia, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Emanuela Polimbratoli.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

808

Esteban Huertas et al., Appellants,
vs.
Jose Vazquez Montes, as Warden of the District Jail of Humacao.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Eugenio Kilayco,
596. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank W. Tillinghast,
Leonard L. Barber and
Isaac H. Farmer
652 vs. Appellants,
John J. Richards, Marshal
of the United States for the
District of Rhode Island

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.; Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co. and Minneapolis Eastern Railway Co.

7-2 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

The application for an order staying the giving effect to the judgment below is granted, and a supersedeas is therefore allowed upon the furnishing within fifteen days of a bond in the penal sum of $50,000 conditioned according to law to be approved by the clerk of this court; and until the furnishing of the bond an order to stay all proceedings including the action of the Commission taken to give effect to the judgment below or that of the trial court which that judgment deals with, a restraining order to that effect also is granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Edgar F. Hartmann and Charles Lee,

.... Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

355 The Houston Oil Co. of Texas et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Cornelius C. Goodrich et al.

On consideration of the motion for a rule to show cause on respondents why they should not be punished for contempt. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

968 John W. Hamer et al.,
Appellants
vs.
New York Railways Co., Metropolitan Street Railway Co. and Central Trust Co. of New York.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White

941 Hendersonville Light & Power Co. et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Blue Ridge Interurban Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

898 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. and Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Lessees of Georgia Railroad & Banking Co. et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. F. Layton.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket—

per
Mr. Chief Justice Whit

Monday, March 19th 1917 continued

850

The Toledo Newspaper Co. and Negley D. Cochran, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

895

Illinois Central Railroad Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. L. A. Henderson

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

938

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Co., Petitioners, vs. J. G. Leach

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel there~~upon had as well~~ in support of ~~as against the same~~, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

980 Interboro Brewing Co. Inc. Petitioner
vs
The Standard Brewing Co. of Baltimore City

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

964 E. J. Lynch Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota Petitioner
vs
Henry Turrish

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted

per Mr Chief Justice White

965

E. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota, Petitioner
vs.
H. C. Hornby

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

953

Arthur A. Bonvillain, Petitioner
vs.
H. B. Howell, Trustee of Arthur A. Bonvillain, Bankrupt

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Clayton County, Kentucky, Petitioner,
774 vs.
Lena Apperson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Clayton County, Kentucky, Petitioner,
775 vs.
Elizabeth Creager.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday March 19th 1917 continued

---

976 W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky, Petitioner, vs. Hugh L. Creager. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

977 W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky, Petitioner, vs. Mildred E. Hord. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

778 W. T. Henderson, Judge of the County Court of Clinton County, Kentucky, Petitioner, vs. Sterling Land & Investment Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

922 Niles R. Van Thyne, Jules Wieslander, Lawrence J. Levy and Walter J. B. Ramee, Petitioners, vs. Ralph Wolf, Trustee in Bankruptcy of J. Fred Pierson, Jr., and Clarence E. Fitt, individually and as copartners &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by

is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

932

Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Ernest H. Ohme, Frank Spitz and Louis Ritter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

935

Mergenthaler Linotype Co., Petitioner, vs. International Typesetting Machine Co., and Charles Hewitt, Receiver of the International Typesetting Machine Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

984 Mergenthaler Linotype Co. Petitioner vs. Intertype Corporation — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

985 Mary E. Sims Ex'x. Sims, Francis Banks et al. Petitioners, vs. W. H. Reed, Receiver, [illegible] E. W. Brown et al — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

900 Paul A. Ewert, Petitioner, vs. C. W. Beck. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

958 Chicago Great Western Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. John Manning. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

965 Lee Lum Simmons, Petitioner, vs. Atlas Transportation Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

936 Glasgow Navigation Co., Limited, Petitioner, vs. Munson Steamship Line — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

951

Winfield S. Pendleton, Petitioner,
vs
American Warehouse & Trading Co. and Dennis Lumber Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

967

Georgia Coast & Piedmont Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs
David Lowenthal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Red Jacket Jr. Coal Co. and Richard Teeple, George Wharton Pepper, and Richard H. Hartz, Trustees, Petitioners,
vs.
United Thacker Coal Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

971

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Bank Note Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Blue Ridge Electric Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

972

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 29th 1915 continued.

885 John A. Gardner, Petitioner, vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

956 Robert H. Oneal, Petitioner, vs. Julia V. Stewart et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Robert A. Woods, by his guardian ad litem, W. B. Woods,
Petitioner,
986 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

J. Schuler et al., copartners doing business under the firm name and style of The Ute Chief Mineral Water Co.,
Petitioners,
987 vs.
The Manitou Springs Mineral Water Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

Monday, March 19th, 1917, continued

791 Alexander M. Emerson, Petitioner, vs. Warren E. Sweeter,

792 Alfred P. Lowell, Petitioner, vs. Warren E. Sweeter.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

390 William E. Peck & Co., Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the defendant in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby reassigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

984 Southern Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Vinnie Butler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Millard Reese in support of the same.

922 North German Lloyd, Claimant &c., Petitioner, vs. Guaranty Trust Co. of New York et al.

Mr. John A. Kratz, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this [illegible] Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs William Warley

On motion of Mr. W. Ashbie Hawkins in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

993 Elliott Frederick, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr Lowe G. Bruton in support of the same and Mr W. K. Jennings in opposition thereto.

994 Standard Fashion Co., Petitioner, vs John J. Kuhn, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr James W. Osborne and Mr Herbert Noble in support of the same, and Mr Jacob J. Lesser in opposition thereto.

580 Hans Berg, Prize Master, etc., et al., Appellants, vs British & African Steam Navigation Co.

723 Hans Berg, Prize Master, etc., et al., Appellants, vs Henry G. Harrison, Master of

Mr Nathaniel Wilson, in behalf of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the that the mandates in these cases issue at once.

958
Mrs W. H. Lee, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Fort Worth Savings Bank & Trust Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr D. T. Bowman in support of the same

985
United County State Bank
Petitioner,
vs.
D. Lloyd Johnson, as Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr William L. Carpenter in support of the same, and Mr Edward J. Moinet in opposition thereto

1065
The National City Bank of Chicago,
Petitioner,
vs.
Kalamazoo City Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr J. S. Flannery and Mr Frederic D. McKenney in support of the same and Mr Dallas Boudeman in opposition thereto.

958 Victor Sakas,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis J. McManus in support of the same.

991 Elma Kelley, Executrix, &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John B. Brooks in support of the same, and Mr. F. D. McKenney in opposition thereto.

1006 Charles A. Ness,
vs. Petitioner,
The State of New Jersey

Mr. Barry Mohun, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a petition for a writ of supersedeas to the New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

262 The Pullman Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. V. Knott, as Comptroller of the State of Florida.

The ~~motion~~ to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas T. West

Kellogg, Mr. C. A. Severance, Mr. Robert E. Olds, Mr. C. S. Fernald and Mr. John C. Hartridge in opposition thereto.

925	The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Appellant, vs. The Travelers Insurance Machine Co.	Mr. John W. Dana, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to transfer the case to the summary docket.
545	The United States, Appellant, vs. United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. La Rue Brown, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 20th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that W. L. Wood, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Henry Clay Tune, it is ordered that Albert Lee Davey, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 26th instant, to Monday, April 9th next.

Order

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 319, 407, 752, 251, 577 and 578, 762, 795, 900, 960, 965, 1197 and 840 be, and they are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, April 8th next, at the head of the call for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Central Fortuna,
167 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of Porto Rico

In Error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. H. P. Leland in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States,
355 vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles F. Choate Jr. and Mr. Frederick P. Fish of counsel for the appellees.

Wednesday, March 21st 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Charles A. Atkinson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry C. South, it is ordered that Joseph Warren House, Jr., Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas and Lee McCandless, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. A. Morling it is ordered that James W. Morse, Esquire, of Estherville, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

945 United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Appellant, vs. The Travelers Insurance Machine Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. D. R. Castleman and Mr. Walter Bennett in support of the same, and Mr. William Marshall Bullitt in opposition thereto.

177 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas on the relation of S. M. Brewster, Attorney General, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

345 The United States, Appellant, vs. United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, of counsel for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Constantine J. Smyth, of counsel for the appellant.

Manufacturers Railway Co. et al. Appellants, vs. The United States et al.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, of counsel for

the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned [illegible] at twelve o'clock.

Thursday March 22d 1917

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene C. Mason it is ordered that John D. Morgan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, it is ordered that W. Russell Osborn, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Dille Wagner, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

221. Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Warley. On motion of Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

398-403. Manufacturers Railway Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States, et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, of counsel for the appellants, Mr. Blackburn Esterline, of counsel for The United States, and Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Daniel N. Kirby, of counsel for the appellants.

601. First National Bank of Bay City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Grant Fellows, Attorney General, &c. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. C. Elliott, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Edward S. Clark, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Henry M. Campbell, of counsel for the defendant

declaration being made, the Court
adjourned until Tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 2nd, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. L. Montague, it is ordered that Alfred E. Cohen, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

261. Motion Picture Patents Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next after

301 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William J. McWhirt.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Britton, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief in this cause.

185 St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. Appellant, vs. William F. McKnight et al. etc., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed per stipulation of counsel.

281 Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Warley.

On motion of Mr. A. E. Cohen in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

784 First National Bank of Bay City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Grant Fellows, Attorney General &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John G. Johnson, of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, by leave of the Court.

124 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States. This cause was argued by Mr. George S. Buckingham, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellee.

52 John H. Van Dyke et al., Appellants, vs. W. Paul Geary et al., &c. et al. This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Prentiss, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Samuel Herrick, of counsel for the appellees.

148 Western Oil Refining Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. M. Lipscomb, Clerk, &c. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. C. True and Mr. A. L. Dorsey, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Frank M. Thompson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, March 26th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter } Associate Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Wayne Parker, it is ordered that Charles W. Parker, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that William H. Winter and Leander A. Dale, Esquires, of El Paso, State of Texas; Tom D. McKeown, Esquire, of Ada; John T. Hays, Esquire, of Hobart, and James M. Hays, Esquire, of Okmulgee, [illegible] attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Philander C. Knox it is ordered that Francis C. McGirr, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Millard Davis, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Doremus it is ordered that J. Walter Dohany, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. and Louisiana & Missouri River Railroad Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri
194 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,	
William J. McWhirt	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Van Devanter.

The State of California,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Deseret Water, Oil & Irrigation Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California

269

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

18

Th[illegible] on the transcript

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

650 Hans Berg, Prize Master in charge of the Prize Ship "Appam", etc., et al., Appellants, vs. British & African Steam Navigation Co., Limited.

722 Hans Berg, Prize Master in charge of the Prize Ship "Appam", etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Henry G. Harrison, Master of the Steamship "Appam", &c.

On consideration of the motion that the mandates in these causes issue at once, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

791 Alexandra M. Emerson, Petitioner, vs. Warren E. Emerson.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday April 9th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

779 Alfred R. Lowell
vs. Petitioner,
Warren E. Sinclair

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

972 North German Lloyd,
Claimant of the Steamship
"Kronprinzessin Cecilie",
vs. Petitioner,
Guaranty Trust Co. of
New York et al

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1148 United States Fidelity
& Guaranty Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The Travelers Insurance
Machine Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, at the foot of the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

985.

Emmet County State Bank, Petitioner,
vs
W. Lloyd Johnson, Trustee, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel ~~in~~ thereupon in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

954.

Mrs W. H. Lee, etc. et al. Petitioners
vs
Fort Worth Savings Bank & Trust Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

984	Southern Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Minnie Butler.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

961	Anna Kelly, Executrix, &c., Petitioner, vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

993

Elliott Frederick, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
vs.
The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. of New York

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

994

Standard Fashion Co., Petitioner,
vs.
John J. Kuhn, as Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

05 National City Bank of Chicago, Petitioner, vs. Kalamazoo City Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that Section 4 of Rule 37 of the rules of this Court be amended so as to read as follows, viz:

4. An application for a writ of certiorari will be deemed in time when the petition therefor, accompanied by the printed record and brief, is filed within the period prescribed by law: Provided that this is followed by submitting the petition in open Court on some motion day not later than the first one which follows a period of four weeks after such filing. Notice of the date of submission and copies of the petition and brief must be served as required by Section 3 of this Rule.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

893
Jas. Wilson & Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

527
The United States,
vs. Appellant,
Daniel J. Leary et al.
Administrators, &c. et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1024
The United States,
vs. Petitioner
Brooklyn Eastern
District Terminal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and Mr. Henry B. Closson in opposition thereto.

481
The United States of America,
vs. Appellant,
The United States Steel
Corporation et al.

Mr. W. C. [illegible] submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file the brief of Mr. H. L. [illegible] appearing as amicus curiae in this cause. Whereupon, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

900	Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Co., vs. Appellant, City of Lincoln et al.	Mr. W. M. Morning of counsel for the appellees submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
958	The Illinois Central Railroad Co., vs. Appellant, State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.	Mr. R. Walton Moore, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
927	American Express Co. et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The State of South Dakota, ex rel. Clarence C. Caldwell, Attorney General, et al.	On motion of Mr. R. Walton Moore in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.
1026	Alexander Doyle, vs. Petitioner, Hamilton Fish Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max J. Kohler in support of the same and leave was granted counsel for both sides to file briefs on or before April 6th next.

Monday, March 26th 1917

939 Central Trust Co. of New York, Petitioner, vs. The Texas Co.

The petition fo
of certiorari
submitted to th
ration of the C
printed argum
Mr Arthur H. Van Brunt in support of
and Mr Amos L. Beaty in opposition

999 Central Trust Co. of New York and Equitable Trust Co. of New York, Petitioners, vs. The Texas Co.

The petition fo
of certiorari
submitted to th
ration of the
printed argum
Mr. Arthur H.
and Mr George
Murray in support of the same, and Mr
Beaty in opposition thereto.

724 Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Co., Appellant, vs. The City of Lincoln et al.

The petition o
pellant for le
file a bill o
in this cause
mitted to the
tion of the Court on printed arguments
Robert Burns, Mr Charles A. Frueauff
E. C. Strode in support of the same, and
W. Berge and Mr. H. H. Manning in op
thereto.

1018
Bryan F. Babbitt,
Trustee, etc.,
vs. Petitioner
Caroline S. Read et al.,
as Executors, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles A. Boston in support of the same, and Mr. Charles E. Rushmore in opposition thereto.

1020
Caroline S. Read et al.,
as Executors, etc., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Bryan F. Babbitt,
Trustee, etc.

The cross petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles E. Rushmore in support of the same, and Mr. P. Taylor Bryan and Mr. George H. Williams in opposition thereto.

1216
Washington Railway &
Electric Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ann Catharine Scala,
Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss and for damages in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. D. W. O'Donoghue and Mr. Arthur A. Alexander in support of the same, and Mr. John S. Barbour in opposition thereto.

1013 Rivers & Harbors Improvement Co. Owner, etc.,
Petitioner.
vs.
John S. Latta et al.

The petition f
writ of certiora
herein was sub
to the considera
of the Court b

Russell T. Mount in support of the same

1018 Matthew Howard Reed.
Petitioner,
vs.
Cropp Concrete Machinery
Co. et al.

The petition f
writ of certiora
herein was sub
to the considera
the Court on p

arguments by Mr. Otto Raymond Barnett in
of the same, and Mr. William Warren Cor
and Mr. Louis T. Gariet in opposition the

1024 Washington Railway
& Electric Co.
Petitioner.
vs.
Mina L. Clark, Administratrix

The petition f
writ of certior
in this cause
the considera
the Court on
arguments by

E. Barbour and Mr. George P. Hoover in
of the same, and Mr. Wilton J. Lambert
Rudolph H. Yeatman in opposition the

986 The Michigan Central
Railroad Co.
Petitioner.
vs.
Everett H. Tripp

The petition
of certiorari
was submitte
consideration

arguments by Mr. J. Walter Dohany and Mr. Frank E. Robinson in support of the same, and Mr. Sidney T. Miller in opposition thereto.

997. Douglas Park Jockey Club, Plaintiff in Equity, vs. J. N. Talbott et al. etc.

The motion for a restraining order or temporary injunction in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Boyle Barton and Mr. Harvey Myers in support of the same, and Mr. Fred Forcht, Mr. John T. Shelby, Mr. Robert L. Northcutt, and Mr. John Loving Shelby in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned to Monday, April 9th next, at twelve o'clock

Monday, April 9th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Guy H. Sturges, Carroll S. Chaplin and Henry P. Frank, Esquires, of Portland, State of Maine, Frank W. McAllister, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, and [illegible] Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that alifornia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf Mr. Chapin Brown, it is ordered that Frank Katzenbach, Jr. Esquire, of Trenton, State of ew Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney nd counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ccordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, it is ordered that rden J. Reed, Esquire, of New York City, admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf Mr. Joseph C. Stone, it is ordered that Mar- n E. Thomas, Esquire, of Eufaula, State of klahoma, and Edward E. Johnson, Esquire, f Wausau, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to ractice as attorneys and counsellors of this ourt, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, it is ordered that Louis J. Stephens, Esquire, of Pierre, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. C. Smith, it is ordered that Louis J. Dunn, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that Ross Young, Esquire, of Longview, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Darlington, it is ordered that Paul B. Cromelin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. R. Davis, it is ordered that John Pettijohn, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

H Davis, Esquire, of Gainesville, State of
orgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney
d counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
ordingly.

e motion first made to the Court in this be-
lf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that
ames Henry Harrison, Esquire, of Newark,
tate of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as
n attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he
as sworn accordingly.

he motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. Thomas Ruffin, it is ordered that Michael
chenck, Esquire, of Hendersonville, State of
orth Carolina, be admitted to practice as an
ttorney and counsellor of this Court, and he
as sworn accordingly.

he motion first made to the Court in this be-
alf by Mr. Edward P. Stout, it is ordered
hat John Wahl Quinn, Esquire, of Jersey
ity, and Francis W. Dobbins, Esquire, of
ahway, State of New Jersey, be admitted to
ractice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court
nd they were sworn accordingly.

683

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mathew T. Treadwell,
Emanuel Carpenter, Jose
Cura, et al.

In Error to th
District Cour
the United St
for the Distric
Rhode Islan

This cause came on to be heard on the tra
of the record from the District Court of
United States for the District of Rhode I
and was argued by counsel. On consider
whereof, It is now here ordered and adjud
by this Court that the judgment of the sa
District Court in this cause be, and the
is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clar

684

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles Hunnelly, Henry
C. Wilcox et al.

In Error to th
District Cour
the United St
for the Distric
Rhode Islan

This cause came on to be heard on the t
of the record from the District Court of
United States for the District of Rhode
and was argued by counsel. On consider
whereof, It is now here ordered and adj
by this Court that the judgment of the s
District Court in this cause be, and the
is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Cla

775 The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edmund O'Toole, Guy C. Moore, John M. Kelly, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

776 The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edmund O'Toole, Guy C. Moore, John M. Kelly, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Jesse Isidor Straus,
Percy S. Straus, and
Herbert N. Straus, composing the firm of R.
H. Macy & Co.,
Petitioners,
370 vs.
Victor Talking Machine Co.

On writ of cer
to the Unite
Circuit Cou
Appeals for t
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the t
of the record from the United States Circu
of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and w
gued by counsel. On consideration where
now here ordered, adjudged and decree
Court that the decree of the said Unite
Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be
same is hereby reversed with costs; and
decree of the District Court of the Unite
for the Southern District of New York
the same is hereby affirmed with costs;
this cause be, and the same is hereby re
to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice C

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

718

Motion Picture Patents Co.
Petitioner
vs.
Universal Film Manufacturing Co. et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

401

The United States of America
vs.
Edward Louis Ginsberg

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the negative, and that the fourth question certified must be answered in the affirmative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

63.	The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James F. Rowell, Maude Rowell, and George [illegible]	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to grant a new trial.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

297.	A. Lee Wait, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Henry H. Blood, Judge &c.	On motion of Mr. C. J. Wilson of counsel for the plaintiff in error, ... is hereby granted

362 The Pullman Co.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. V. Knott, as Comptroller
of the State of Florida

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of a proper defendant in error to stand in judgment.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

687 The United States
vs.
Lucky L. Walter and
Mamie E. Walter

On a certificate from
the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Monday, April 9th 1917

124 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.,
vs Appellant,
The United States.

Appeal from
District Cou
the United
for the South

trict of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on th
of the record from the District Court o
United States for the Southern District
York, and was argued by counsel. On c
tion whereof, It is now here ordered, ad
and decreed by this Court that the decr
said District Court in this cause be, an
same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice M

38 Franklin O. Bunting
vs Plaintiff in Error
The State of Oregon.

In Error to
preme Cou
State of Or

This cause came on to be heard on the
of the record from the Supreme Court
State of Oregon, and was argued by co
consideration whereof, It is now here o
adjudged by this Court that the judgm
the said Supreme Court in this cause
same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Mc

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

(Mr Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

649 The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Solomon Kenofskey.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice McKenna.

5 Frank C. Stettler, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edwin V. O'Hara, Bertha Moores, and Amedee M. Smith, constituting the Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of Oregon.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of

the State of Oregon, and was argued b
On consideration whereof, the Court b
ly divided in opinion, It is now here or
adjudged by this Court that the judgm
the said Supreme Court in this cause
the same is hereby affirmed with costs.
per Mr. Chief Justice
(Mr. Justice Brandeis, having been of c
took no part in the consideration of this

26 Elmira Simpson, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edwin V. O'Hara, Bertha
Moores and Amedee M.
Smith, constituting the
Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of
Oregon.

In Error
Supreme
of the Sta
Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the
of the record from the Supreme Court o
of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.
deration whereof the Court being equally
in opinion. It is now here ordered, a
by this Court that the judgment of th
Supreme Court in this cause be, and
hereby affirmed with costs.
per Mr. Chief Just
(Mr. Justice Brandeis, having been of c
took no part in the consideration of

[illegible] Lee Wilson & Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

527 The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
Daniel J. Leary et al.
Administrators, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The City of Lincoln et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 9th, 1917 contin

Illinois Central Railroad Co., Appellant,
vs.
State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.
955

On consideration of the motion to
this cause, It i
been ordered by
Court that said
tion be, and the
is hereby, grant
the cause assigned for argument on Tues
October 2d next, after the cases heretofore
for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice W

Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Co., Appellant,
vs.
The City of Lincoln et al.
700

On consideration of the motion for
to file a bill
upon hearing, Th
been ordered, by
Court that the said motion be, and the sa
hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice

Douglas Park Jockey Club, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
T. H. Talbot et al. &c.
997

On consideration of the motion for
staying order
pending appeal
in. It is now h
dered by the Court that the said motion b
the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice

828 Washington Railway & Electric Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ann Catherine Scala, Administratrix, &c.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, May 7th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

948 Victor Pedro, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1048 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well [illegible] the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

987 Central Trust Co. of New York, Petitioner, vs. The Texas Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

999 Central Trust Co. of New York, et al., Petitioners, vs. The Texas Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

he Michigan Central
ilroad Co.,
Petitioner.
vs.
ith H. Tripp.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

consideration of the petition for a writ of cer-
rari herein to the United States Circuit Court
Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the ar-
ment of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup-
rt of as against the same, it is now here ordered
y this Court that the said petition be, and the
ame is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

yron F. Babbitt,
rustee in bankruptcy of
he Randolph Macon
oal Co., bankrupt,
Petitioner
vs.
meline S. Read, George
W. Wickersham, and
oseph H. Dorman, Execu-
ors of William A. Read,
eceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certio-
rari herein to the United States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument
of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as
against the same, it is now here ordered by this
Court that the said petition be, and the same is

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Caroline E. Read, George W. Wickersham, and Joseph H. Seaman, as Executors of William A. Read, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
1020 vs.
Byron F. Babbitt, Trustee in bankruptcy of The Randolph Macon Coal Co., bankrupt.

On petition for a cross writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a cross writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rivers & Harbors Improvement Co., Owner and Claimant of the Dredge "Yonkers", Petitioner,
1018 vs.
John B. Latta et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

1018 Matthew Howard Reed, Petitioner, vs. Cropp Concrete Machinery Co. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

1024 Washington Railway & Electric Co., Petitioner, vs. Emma L. Clark, Administratrix of the Estate of George W. Clark, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justi

Alexander Doyle, | On petition for w
1026 vs. Petitioner, | tiorari to the Uni
Hamilton Fish Corpo- | Circuit Court of
ration. | for the Second Ci

On consideration of the petition for a w
certiorari herein to the United States Ci
Court of Appeals for the Second Circu
the argument of counsel thereupon had
in support of as against the same, it i
ordered by this Court that the said pe
and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Ju

The United States, | Mr. Solicitor G
741 vs. | Davis in beha
Bessie Wildcat, a | counsel for D
minor, et al. | Knight, one of
| ists in this case

at the death of the said David Knig
moved the Court to make C. C. Taylor
of the person and estate of Wiley Knig
minor and sole heir of the said Davi
deceased, a party respondent herein i
of the said David Knight, deceased,
It is now here ordered by the Court
Taylor, guardian of the person and est

Knight, deceased, be, and he is hereby, made a party respondent in this cause.

1012	The United States, Appellant, vs. Illinois Central Rail road Co et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

1015	The United States, Petitioner, vs. William B. Poland et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr

Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and leave was granted counsel for the respondents to file brief in opposition thereto within ten days.

1016	David M. Sealey, Petitioner, vs. The City of Marceline, in the County of Linn and State of Missouri	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

John T. Wayland in support of the same.

924 Wirt K. Winton, Administrator, etc., et al.,
Appellants
vs.
Jack Amos et al., etc.

Mr. William W. Scott, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein, and leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis to file brief in opposition thereto.

926 John Louden,
Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos et al., etc.

927 Walter S. Field et al.
Appellants,
vs.
Jack Amos et al., etc.

930 Katie A. Hume, Executrix, etc.,
Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos et al., etc.

Mr. Owen Miller, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein, and leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis to file brief in opposition thereto.

1057 Charles W. [illegible], Jr.
Petitioner,
vs.
North German Lloyd.

1058 Maurice Neumann,
Petitioner,
vs.
North German Lloyd

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. Edward C. Blodgett in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph Larocque, Mr. Walter C. Noyes and Mr. Joseph D. Bedle in opposition thereto.

993 Southern Pacific Co., Petitioner,
vs
California Adjustment Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. W. Durbrow and Mr. William F. Herrin in support of the same, and Mr. Leon E. Morris in opposition thereto.

932 Hathaway Harper, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the second and printed arguments by Mr. Charles J. Kappler in support of the same, and Mr. Arthur G. Moseley in opposition thereto.

994 W. T. [illegible], Judge &c., Petitioner,
vs
[illegible]

995 W. T. [illegible], Judge &c., Petitioner,
vs
Elizabeth [illegible]

Mr. W. O. Harris, Jr., in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance

976	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., Petitioner vs. Hugh S. Gardner	Same order.
977	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., Petitioner vs. Mildred E. Hooker	
978	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., Petitioner vs. Sterling Land & Investment Co.	

789 Alexander M. Emerson, Petitioner, vs. Warren E. [illegible]

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Henry Wheeler, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause: Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

790 Alfred R. Lowell, Petitioner, vs. Warren E. [illegible]

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Henry Wheeler, of counsel for the

writ of certiorari in this cause, Therefore, in
sideration of said motion, it is now here ordered
t adjudged by this Court that the writ of cer-
ari in this cause be, and the same is hereby,
missed with costs.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

ncis Donnelley et al., Petitioners,
vs.
ntral Agency Co.,
, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argu-
nts by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline and Mr. Perry
llen in support of the same, and Mr. Charles
tzell and Mr. Malcolm Donald in oppo-
tion thereto.

llinois Surety Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
tandard Underground
able Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on print-
d arguments by Mr. Albert J. Hopkins in sup-
rt of the same, and Mr. George B. Gordon
n opposition thereto.

y B. Biddinger,
Appellant,
vs.
he Commissioner of
lice of the City of
New York

The motion to advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

arguments by Mr. [illegible] J. [illegible] and
Marshall, of counsel for the appellee in s
of the motion, and Mr. Moses H. Groom
counsel for the appellant in opposition th

Ex parte: In the matter
of The Eastern Trans-
portation Co.,
25 Original Petitioner

Mr. Frederi
Tyler, on beh
Mr. Harry W
dity, couns
ousing parti

ted to the consideration of the Court a mo
said parties for leave to file an additional
to the rule to show cause herein.

Thomas Gilmore,
1056 Petitioner
vs.
G. R. McCullough et al.

The petition
writ of certio
on was subm
the considera

in principle argument
the Court by Mr. A. J. Baldwin in supp
[illegible]
the same, and leave was granted to file
within ten days.

Charles Hathaway et al. &c.,
1017 Petitioners,
vs.
Joseph B. Martindale
et al., Receivers, &c.

The petition
of certiorari
was submitte
consideration
Court on pa

ments by Mr. Alfred B. Cruikshank, a
of the same, and Mr. Charles B. Smith
opposition thereto.

119 Rose Levy as liquidating agent, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mollie Wiggins.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Harvey R. Moore, Mr. Henry E. Hoff, and Mr. Harry G. Seymour in support of the same, and Mr. W. T. Wilson and Mr. Frank A. Chase in opposition thereto.

13 Original. The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

On motion of Mr. Frank W. McAllister of counsel for the complainant, leave is hereby granted to file a stipulation of counsel for the appointment of a commissioner to take and report the testimony in this cause, and the motion for the appointment of said commissioner was thereupon submitted by Mr. McAllister.

297 A. Lee Weil, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Henry K. Black, Judge of the Intermediate Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, and The State of West Virginia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, Mr. Columbus F. Wilson of counsel for the plaintiff in error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Order for mandate see p [illegible])

The State of Arkansas
Complainant.
6 Original vs.
The State of Tennessee

Mr. Carruthers Ewing, of counsel for the complainant submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to fix the time within which the defendant shall take proofs and to designate time for the submission of this cause.

Union Sand & Material Co.
1039 vs. Petitioner.
The State of Arkansas

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carruthers Ewing in support of the same.

Charles D. Smith
et al., etc., et al.,
995 vs. Petitioners,
Craighead County et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Carruthers Ewing in support of the same, and Mr. J. S. Barton in opposition thereto.

he State of Georgia,
Complainant,
vs.
he Tennessee Copper Co.
t al.

Mr. Joe V. Williams,
in behalf of Mr.
Frank M. Thompson,
Attorney General of
Tennessee, submitted

o the consideration of the Court a motion of
e intervener, State of Tennessee, for the modi-
cation of [illegible] former orders and decrees in this cause.

entucky Coal & Coke Co.,
Petitioner
vs.
Barber Ellison.

The petition for a
writ of certiorari
herein was submitted
to the consideration
f the Court by Mr. White B. Miller in sup-
port of the same.

American Steel Foundries,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Tri-City Central
Trades Council et al.

The petition for a
writ of certiorari
herein was submit-
ted to the consider-
ation of the Court
on printed arguments by Mr. Max Pam in sup-
port of the same, and Mr. Frank C. Smith
in opposition thereto.

the Smallfield Publish-
ing Co. et al.
Petitioners
vs.
L & Co. Mossman Co.

The petition for a
writ of certiorari
herein was submit-
ted to the consider-
ation of the Court
by Mr. Wade H. Ellis and

Mr. Charles W. Ellis in support of th
and Mr. William W. Hale in opposi
to.

1006 Charles A. Morse, vs The State of New Jersey. Petitioner

The petition fo
of certiorari h
submitted to th
eration of the C
prealed argumen

Mr. Barry Mahan and Mr. Henry E.
in support of the same, and Mr. J. H.
and Mr. Wilbur A. Mott in opposition t
Leave was granted counsel for the petiti
an additional brief before Friday next.

392 The St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co. vs. Maud Smith, Administratrix, etc. Plaintiff in Error,

The motion
was in effe
same was s
to the consid
the Court o
and and fa

guments by Mr. Judson H. Wood and M
P. Hamm in support of the same, and M
Evans and Mr. Frank Anderson in oppo
thereto.

371 Emma F. Dorpel et al. heirs, etc., vs. Lottie E. Jones et al. Plaintiffs in Error,

The motion
was in eff
the same
mitted to

on the record and printed arguments by Mr J. F. King and Mr. W. T. Harkney in support of the cause, and Mr. Milton Brown in opposition thereto.

The Norfolk & Western Railway Co.
 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Cornelius H. Phelan

628

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Fourth Judicial District, State of Ohio

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

International Lumber Co.,
 vs. Plaintiff in Error
The United States.

519

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed at the foot of the call for today.

The Ohio River Contract Co.,
 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Honorable Thomas R. Gordon
Judge, etc.

190

This cause was argued by Mr. W. Overton Harris, of counsel for the plaintiff in error

Monday, April 9th 1917 contin

Matthew O'Doherty, of counsel for the de
in error.

702 Seaboard Air Line
Railway,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Cynthia Williams,
Administratrix, etc.

This cause wa
by Mr. J. B.
of counsel for
tiff in error, a
W. Boyd, Esq
counsel for the

and in error.

281 The Minneapolis & St.
Louis Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Nora Gotschall, as Ad-
ministratrix, etc.

These causes we
submitted by
Williams, of
ror and Mr
M. Moore, of
for the plaintiff

and argued by Mr. Lyle Pettijohn, of co
the defendant in error.

377 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Clark Brothers
378 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Isaac W. Cann et al.

The arg
these ca
commence
Frederick
Kerney
for the pl
error an

by Mr. E. L. Stock of counsel for the defend

Proclamation being made, the Court is adj

Tuesday, April 10th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Lloyd W. Read, Esquire of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. Rushman, it is ordered that Herbert B. Moore, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, April 16th, 1907 continu

398
Rosa C. Goode, Thomas J. Goode, E. Chambers Goode, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
The United States.

In Error to th
of Appeals of
District of Co

This cause having been called to the attentio
the Court by Mr. Henry P. Blair, of counse
the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved
Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cau
Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is
here ordered and adjudged by this Court
the writ of error in this cause be and the sa
hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Fu

577
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Clark Brothers

578
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Isaac W. Lowe et al.

The argumen
these causes c
concluded by
E. F. Stock
sel for the ap
in error.

782
Seaboard Air Line Railway,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
J. N. Lewis

This cause was
by Mr. J. B.
of counsel for
plaintiff in er
Mr. James

195 Albert E. Sutton et al.,
vs. Appellants,
John H. & L. English et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Allen G. Fisher of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Earl H. Smith, of counsel for the appellees.

407 Bettina S. Yankauer
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Moses Feltheimer et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Jacob W. Hartman, of counsel for the defendants in error.

760 The Missouri Pacific
Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Margaret L. Taber, guardian, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. Thomas Hackney and Mr. Matthew Lyons of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John T. Wayland, of counsel for the defendant in error.

768 John W. Hamer et al.,
vs. Appellants,
New York Railways Co.
et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. E. Gilbert, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Richard

Tuesday, April 10th 1917 continued

Reid Rogers, of counsel for the appellee.

497

Hendersonville Light
& Power Co. et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Blue Ridge Interurban
Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Michael Schaap, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Charles W. Tillett, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, April 11th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Vahey, it is ordered that Jacob L. Basky, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that Oliver E. Sweet, Esquire, of Rapid City, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, April 11th, 1917, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Smith, it is ordered that Harry C. Howard, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph F. O'Connell, it is ordered that John F. Barry, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

571 Emma F. Doepel et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Luther B. Jones

On motion of Mr. Samuel Herrick in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error leave is hereby granted to file a supplemental brief in this cause.

800 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. O. Y. Layton.

This cause was argued by Mr. Bowden McDaniel, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Marion Smith, of counsel for the defendant in error,

[illegible]
United States Fidelity
Guaranty Co.,
Appellant,
v.
The Travelers Insurance
Machine Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. David R. Castleman, of counsel for the appellee.

863
Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Swen Hoglund.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Francis W. Clements, of counsel for the defendant in error.

651
The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Foster L. Davis.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

169
Charles Mason et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed record with leave to counsel to file briefs hereafter.

741. The United States vs. Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al.

On motion of Mr. R. C. Allen in their behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as *amicus curiae*.

741. The United States vs. Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for The United States four and one-half hours are allowed for the argument of this cause and three counsel allowed in the argument for Bessie Wildcat et al. The argument was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for The United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, April 12th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, it is ordered that Frank M. Powell, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia; Howard F. Bishop, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and A. A. Davidson, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter, it is ordered that John R. Milburn and Ernest F. Mechlin, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and coun-

sellors of this Court, and they were sworn
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
half by Mr Augustus Clapp, it is order
Ernest E. Watson, Esquire, of St. Pau
of Minnesota, be admitted to practice
attorney and counsellor of this Court, a
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
half by Mr Will R. Wood, it is order
Clare R. Tinkham, Esquire, of Newca
of Indiana, be admitted to practice as a
ney and counsellor of this Court, and h
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
by Mr J. C. Stone, it is ordered that
Johnston, Esquire, of Wooster, State of O
be admitted to practice as an attorney an
sellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac

741 The United States vs. Bessie Whitehead, a minor, et al.	On motion of Clements in b leave is hereby him to file a his names as

Curiam.

[illegible] Harriet H. Arnold et al., Appellants, vs. Hyde Park Water Co. et al. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Deitrick and Mr. Roscoe Walsworth, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Robert M. Morse and Mr. William M. Richardson, of counsel for the appellees.

148 The United States, vs. Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for The United States, Mr. Joseph C. Stone and Mr. John J. Shea, of counsel for Bessie Wildcat et al.; by Mr. A. A. Davidson, of counsel for Charles F. Brandt et al.; Mr. Charles B. Stuart, of counsel for Bessie Wildcat et al., and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for The United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, April 13th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Chilton Atkinson, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, it is ordered that Warren J. Duffey, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. J. W. King, it is ordered that C. E. Cor-
Esquire, of Wewoka, State of Oklahoma, be
mitted to practice as an attorney and coun-
lor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. Willard Martin, it is ordered that W. W.
ffinger, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Okla
ma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and
nsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accord
ly

erican Express Co. nt. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, State of South Dakota ex rel. Clarence C. Caldwell ll, Attorney General, etc. nt.	On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Folk. in that behalf. leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as *amicus curiae*
harles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Warley	On motion of Mr. Chilton Atkinson, in that behalf. leave is hereby grant-

d to file a brief in this cause as *amicus curiae*.

he United States vs. Bowie Wildcat a	The argument of this cause was con- continued cluded, by Mr. At- torney General Gre

ful, of counsel for The United States.

591 G. Washington Loft, Appellant, vs. David W. Pittman Sheriff, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John Randolph Cooper, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Clifford W. Walker, of counsel for the appellee.

582 American Express Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of South Dakota ex rel. Clarence C. Caldwell, Attorney General, etc. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. O. Bailey of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. B. P. Kerfoot, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. O. W. Sweet, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. B. P. Kerfoot, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

718 The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. Illinois Central Rail road Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sanderson, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. W.

Monday April 16th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Graham, it is ordered that John S. Furman Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Gregory, it is ordered that F. C. Proctor, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam Rayburn, it is ordered that Thomas H. Franklin, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Albert L. Hopkins, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Coleman, it is ordered that Arthur Du Bois, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co. Petitioner

23 Original

The application of the parties is granted in so far as it seeks that they be permitted to file a brief in support of the return made or to be made in compliance with the order heretofore entered (see Ex parte Indiana Transportation Company 242 U.S. 281) and in other respects the applic

85
Harriet H. Gould and
Frederick Waldron,
Appellants,
vs.
Hyde Park Water Co.,
First National Bank
of Boston and City
of Boston.

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States
for the District of
Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

392
St. Louis, San Francisco
& Texas Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Maud Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of
W. T. Beale, deceased.

In Error to the Court
of Civil Appeals for
the Fifth Supreme
Judicial District
of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

432

Hathaway Harper,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County, State of Oklahoma, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

619

Don Lacy, as Liquidating Agent of the Oklahoma City National Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
Mollie Eggers.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss or af-consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
Plaintiff in Error,
758 vs.
Cynthia Williams, Administratrix of the Estate of W. E. Williams, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.,
Appellant,
998 vs.
The Franklin Insurance Machine Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and

was argued by counsel. On consideration w
It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decre
this Court that this appeal be, and the s
hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdic
per Mr. Chief Justic

A. S. Cohn,
852 vs. Petitioner,
R. A. Malone, Trustee
of A. S. Cohn, Bankrupt.

It is ordered
Court that th
entered herein
March 6th, 19
ing the petitio

writ of certiorari, be vacated and set aside
that said petition for a writ of certiorari, b
the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justic

Samuel C. Cohen
as Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Elias W. Samuels, Bank
rupt,
855 vs. Petitioner,
Elias W. Samuels

It is order
the Court
order entere
on March
denying th
for a writ
be vacated

aside, and that said petition for a writ o
be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Jus

The State of Georgia,
1, Original vs. Complainant,
Tennessee Copper Co. et al.

On conside
the motio
intervene

ued

ration of
ned by
grams is
tion
White

by the
the order
on
1917, being
for a
e, and
he, and

White

ed by
that the
ed herein
6th 1917
petition
of certiorari
and set
of testimony

White

ation of
of the
the State

---

to former orders and decrees of this Court, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

The State of Arkansas,
6, Original vs Complainant,
The State of Tennessee

It is ordered by the Court that the defendant proceed to take its testimony and file same with the Clerk of this Court on or before the 1st of July next. It is further ordered that this case be assigned for hearing on Tuesday, October 2d next.

per Mr Chief Justice White

The State of Missouri,
13 Original vs Complainant,
Chicago, Burlington &
Quincy Railroad Co.

It is ordered by the Court that A. F. Rector, Esquire, of Marshall, Missouri, be appointed Commissioner to take the testimony in this case, and report the same to the Court.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Guy R. Biddinger,
993 vs Appellant,
The Commissioner of
Police of the City of
New York

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge
of the County Court of
Taylor County, Kentucky,
Petitioner,
974 vs.
Louis Apperson.

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge
of the County Court of
Taylor County, Kentucky,
Petitioner,
975 vs.
Elizabeth Creager.

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge
of the County Court of
Taylor County, Kentucky,
Petitioner,
976 vs.
Hugh S. Gardner.

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge
of the County Court of
Taylor County, Kentucky,
Petitioner,
977 vs.
Mildred E. Harker.

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge
of the County Court of
Taylor County, Kentucky,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Starlight Land & Investment

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 16th, 1917 continued

t R. Winton, Adminis-
trator of the Estate of
mbell F. Winton, deceased, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
ard Amos and others, known
the Mississippi Choctaws.
rles Loudon,
Appellant,
vs.
ard Amos and others, known
the Mississippi Choctaws.
Walter E. Field and Madison
M. Lindly,
Appellants,
vs.
d Amos and others, known
the Mississippi Choctaws.
Katie A. Howe, Executrix of
the Estate of Chester Howe, de-
ceased
Appellant,
vs.
ford Amos and others, known
as the Mississippi Choctaws

On consideration of the motions for writs of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record herein; It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

mma F. Dapple et al.,
heirs at law of Hollis
N. Townsend, deceased,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Walter B. Jones, Homer Jones,
and the Phoenix Mutual
Life Insurance Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket, and assigned for Monday, May 7th next, after the case
Per Mr. Chief

tofore assigned for that day

Monday, April 16th, 1917 contin

Southern Pacific Co.
995 vs. Petitioner
California Adjustment Co.

On petition for
certiorari to
States Circuit
Appeals for the
Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a wri
tiorari herein to the United States Circui
of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of
ment of counsel thereupon had, as well in
of as against the same, it is now here orde
this Court that the said petition be and
is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice

Charles D. Smith and
Walter L. Smith, com-
posing the firm of
Charles D. Smith & Co.,
998 vs. Petitioners
Copiah County et al.

On petition f
certiorari to
States Circui
Appeals for t
Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a wri
rari herein to the United States Circui
Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of a
of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup
against the same, it is now here ordered
Court that the said petition be, and the
hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justi

1006

Charles A. Jones,
Petitioner,
vs.
The State of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1016

David W. Sidey,
Petitioner,
vs.
The City of Marceline, in the County of Linn and State of Missouri.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles Hathaway et al, composing the firm of Hathaway, Smith, Folds & Co, Petitioners,
1019. vs.
Joseph B. Martindale and Frederic A. Juilliard, Receivers of The H. B. Claflin Co.

On petition f
of certiorari
United State
Court of Appe
the Second C

On consideration of the petition for a wri
tiorari herein to the United States Circui
of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and o
gument of counsel thereupon had, as well
of argument the same, it is now here or
this Court that the said petition be, an
same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justi

The Saalfield Publishing Co and A. J. Saalfield, Petitioners,
1022. vs.
G. & C. Merriam Co.

On petition
of certiorari
United Sta
Court of Ap
the Sixth C

On consideration of the petition for a wr
rari herein to the United States Circuit C
Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the
of counsel thereupon had, as well as in opp
against the same, it is now here ordere
Court that the said petition be and

1088

Illinois Surety Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Standard Underground Cable Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1089

Union Sand & Material Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The State of Arkansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1047. Frances Smiddy et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Central Aguirre Co., etc.,
et al.

On petition for writ
certiorari to the U
States Circuit Cour
Appeals for the Fir
Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ
tiorari herein to the United States Circuit
of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the
ment of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup
of as against the same, it is now here ordere
this Court that the said petition be, and the
is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

1048. Fentress Coal & Coke Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Becker Elmore.

On petition for wri
certiorari to the
States Circuit Co
Appeals for the
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ
tiorari herein to the United States Circuit
of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the
ment of counsel in support of the same, it
here ordered by this Court that the said p
be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice

1037 Charles W. Rantoul, Jr., Petitioner, v. North German Lloyd. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1038 Maurice Hanssens, Petitioner, vs. North German Lloyd. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
293 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Grover C. Remington.

In Error to th
trict Court of
United States f
Western Distric

Virginia.
This cause having been called to the atten
the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davi
sel for the plaintiff in error, and he havin
the Court to dismiss the writ of error in t
Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it
here ordered and adjudged by this Court
writ of error in this cause be and the sam
dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justic

The United States
ex rel Ng Sam et al.
1031 vs. Petitioners,
Joseph H. Wallis,
Assistant Commissioner
of Immigration &c.

The petition
writ of certio
herein was s
to the consid
of the Court
by argument
Robert M. M

support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor G
Davis in opposition thereto.

Paul Hill Saunders,
472 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Daniel Shean et al.

The motion
to affirm
cause was s
to the consi

the Court on the record and printed arg

same, and Mr. William Brown Hall in opposition thereto.

1058 Sidney J. Brooks, Receiver etc., Petitioner, vs. Empire Trust Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg and Mr. Walter P. Napier in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas H. Franklin, Mr. Stephen H. Olin and Mr. Henry C. Cooke in opposition thereto.

1060 & 1061 Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Co.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Christopher M. Bradley in support of the same, and Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. William F. Herrin in opposition thereto.

1062 Northern Pacific Railway Co. et al. Petitioners, vs. E. W. McComas

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. James B. Kerr and Mr. Charles A. Hart in support of the

187 Mount Vernon & Marshall Hall Steamboat Co., Limited, Petitioner, vs. John L. McKenney

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Morris Murphy, Mr. Daniel Thew Wright and Mr. Henry F. Woodard in support of the same.

1002 Union Pacific Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Eva E. Cook, Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alfred G. Ellick and Mr. N. H. Loomis in support of the same, and Mr. William R. Green in opposition thereto.

1003 Union Pacific Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Maude M. Henderson, Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alfred G. Ellick and Mr. N. H. Loomis in support of the same, and Mr. T. J. Mahoney and Mr. J. A. C. Kennedy in opposition thereto.

1042 Hugh Chambers, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. Continental Trust Co. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by R. S. Wimberly in support of the same, and Mr. George S. Jones and Mr. Orville A. Park in opposition thereto.

1060 Joseph Hertzberg, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Jeffreys Carlin in support of the same.

1073 Presbyterian Home Hospital et al., Petitioners, vs. Mary Dorsey Cook, etc. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Stuart and Mr. John W. Farley in support of the same.

1074 Keystone Wood Co., Petitioner, vs. Susquehanna Boom Co. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone in support of the same, and Mr. Max L. Mitchell and [illegible] Edwards in [illegible] tion thereto

Willie M. Ewing
Administratrix, etc.,
798 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Norfolk & Western Rail
way Co.

Mr. W. L. W
counsel for th
tiff in error,
to the consid
the Court a
term to presen

prosecute in this cause.

The Cuyahoga River
Power Co.,
342 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Northern Realty Co.
et al.

The motion to
or affirm an
was submitted
consideration
Court on th
granted, ma

Mr. Joseph H. Clark and Mr. John C.
in support of the same, and Mr. Will
Davis, Mr. Connett & Walter and Mr. J
Wells in opposition thereto

Walter Brandt,
468 vs. Appellant,
Thomas W. Morgan,
Warden, etc.

Appeal from
Circt. Court
States for th
of Kansas

It appearing to the Court that a moti
for the appellant to dismiss this appeal
filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said m
now here ordered, adjudged and dec

dismissed with costs
per Mr. Chief Justice White

318
The United States et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The Illinois Central
Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

932
North German Lloyd,
Claimant, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Guaranty Trust Co. of
New York, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph Larocque, of counsel for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, of counsel for the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, and by Mr. James M. Beck, of counsel for The National City Bank.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, April 17th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Frank Paul, it is ordered that G. G. Bower, Esquire, of Bainbridge, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, it is ordered that Justin Frank Seiler, Esquire, of Elizabethton, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. John Lind, it is ordered that F. V. Brown,
uire of Seattle, State of Washington, and Guy
C. Rohe, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of
nesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys
d counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn
cordingly.

lexander M. Emerson,
Petitioner
vs.
arren E. Sweetser.
lfred P. Lowell,
Petitioner
vs.
arren E. Sweetser

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the Respondent, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandates in these cases.

lbert Pick & Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
rank C. Jordan,
ecretary of State of the
tate of California.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. I. Brobeck, counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. U. S. Webb and Raymond Benjamin, of counsel n the defendant in error.

orth German Lloyd,
laimant, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
uaranty Trust Co. of
ew York et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Walter C. Noyes, of counsel for the petitioner

519 International Lumber Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States

In Error to th
United State
cuit Court of
peals for the

Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the tra
of the record from the United States Circuit
of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and the
plaintiff in error having been thrice solemn
ly called by the Marshal to come into Court
prosecute its writ of error, and failing to ap
it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th
of this Court and on motion of Mr. Solic
General Davis, of counsel for the defendant
now here ordered and adjudged by this Co
that this cause be, and the same is hereby
and that this cause be, and the same is her
remanded to the said United States Circu
Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit to
ceeded in according to law and justice.

per Mr. Chief Justic

721 Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, Petitioner, vs. The United States ex rel. The Fowler Car Co. respondent

This cause cam
by Mr. Solici
eral Davis, o
for the petit
Mr. George L
ion of counsel

87 The Hart Steel Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
The Railroad Supply Co.,

93 The Railroad Supply Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, of counsel for The Hart Steel Co. et al. and Elyria Iron and Steel Co., and continued by Mr. Taylor E. Brown, of counsel for The Railroad Supply Co.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, April 18th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe T. Robinson, it is ordered that Farmer L. McBain, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fiorello H. La Guardia, it is ordered that Edgar Bromberger and Henry C. Samuel, Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Mr. S. S. Gregory it is ordered that Tappan
gory Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois
admitted to practice as an attorney and coun
r of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

ny G. S. Noble, etc.,
vs. Appellant,
Western Union
graph Co. et al.
ny G. S. Noble, etc.,
vs. Appellant,
United Telegram
et al.

Mr. N. S. Robbins of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

Hart Steel Co. et al.
Petitioners
vs.
Railroad Supply Co.
Railroad Supply Co.
Petitioner
vs.
yria Iron & Steel Co.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Taylor E. Brown, of counsel for The Railroad Supply Co. and concluded by Mr. Frank F. Reed
counsel for The Hart Steel Co. et al. and Elyria
Iron & Steel Co.

& Santa Fe Pacific
Railroad Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Franklin K. Lane
Secretary of the Interior

This cause was argued by Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel

for the appellee

Wednesday, April 18th, 1917 continued.

171	Chicago Life Insurance Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Bertha R. Cherry	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Atkinson of counsel for the plaintiffs in error,

and Mr. Vernon R. Loucks of counsel for the defendant in error.

176	Chicago Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. of Idaho, Appellant, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. M. Dudley of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Thursday, April 19th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Hampton D. Ewing, Esquire, of New York City, and Redmond D. Stephens, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that John H. Cox, Esquire, of Mansfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, April 19th, 1917 continued

198

The Salt Lake Investment Co.
vs Plaintiff in Error,
Oregon Short Line Rail road Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, per stipulation of counsel.

176

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. of Idaho
vs Appellant,
The United States

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. F. W. Dudley of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. H. H. Field of counsel for the appellant.

178

Emma Taylor, Administratrix, &c., et al.,
vs Plaintiffs in Error,
Drainage District Number Fifty six, of Emmet County, Iowa, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edgar A. Morling of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. J. W. Morse and Mr. N. J. Olsen, of counsel for the defendants in error.

179

Frank P. Chesbrough,
vs Plaintiff in Error,
Frank T. Woodworth.

180

Frank T. Woodworth
vs Plaintiff in Error,

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward S. Clark of counsel for Frank T. Woodworth

Thursday, April 19th, 1917, continued

Thomas A. E. Weadock, counsel for Frank P. Chesbrough.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, April 20th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present,
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clayton R. Lusk, it is ordered that Thomas H. Dowd, Esquire, of Cortland, and Peter F. McAllister, Esquire, of Ithaca, State of New York be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willard Saulsbury it is ordered that Charles F. Curley, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Charles Wheeler, it is ordered that P. W. McMullan, Esquire, of Elizabeth City, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

193.
Norfolk Southern Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. C. Chastain.

On motion of Mr. Charles Wheeler, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted Mr. C. M. Bain to argue this cause pro *hac vice*.

1046
Schneider Granite Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al.

Mr. C. B. Allen, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

195
Adolfo Garcia Granada,
Plaintiff in Error and Appellant,
vs.
José Sta. Romana et al., a commercial partnership doing business under the firm name of "La [illegible]"

In Error to and Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of error in this cause and this appeal be, and the same are hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

179 Frank P. Chesbrough, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank T. Woodworth.
180 Frank T. Woodworth, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank P. Chesbrough.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas A. E. Weadock of counsel for Frank P. Chesbrough and concluded by Mr. Edward S. Clark of counsel for Frank T. Woodworth.

185 McGoldrick Lumber Co., Appellant, vs. Charles J. Kinsolving et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John P. Gray of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. James H. Forney and Mr. Frank L. Moore of counsel for the appellees.

189 Patrick Sutton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of New Jersey
190 Frank Mahon, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of New Jersey

These causes were argued by Mr. Frank Bergen of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr.

sel for the defendant in error.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Co. vs. W. C. Chatman. Plaintiff in Error. 197 — This cause was argued by Mr. E. M. Bain (by special leave) for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles Whedbee and Mr. P. W. McMullan, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. vs. James H. Barlow. Plaintiff in Error. 198 — This cause was argued by Mr. Peter F. McAllister, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Clayton R. Lusk of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 2nd, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Louis H. Mack, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that S. Milton Simpson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin C. Hilliard, it is ordered that William H. Eaton, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lyndon A. Smith, it is ordered that George A. Bangs, Esquire, of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, it is ordered that Otis F. Ward and William B. Dudley, Esquires, of Hot Springs, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick D. Conner, it is ordered that Frederick W. Mansfield, Esquire, of Boston, and John E. Swift, Esquire, of Milford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
[illegible]

Monday, April 23d, 1917, continued.

P. McGowan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Robert Edward Little, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

763 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. H. Lorick.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds

ndersonville Light &
ower Co. and Intervenor.
endersonville Interurban
ailway Co.,
Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
lue Ridge Interurban
ailway Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

his cause came on to be heard on the transcript f the record from the Supreme Court of the State f North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered nd adjudged by this Court that the judgment f the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and he same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

he United States of
merica,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Foster L. Davis.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript f the record from the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel. On consideration where- f, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna

493

Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al.
vs.
The United States of America

On certificate from and writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified by deducting the costs which were incurred in that Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

nowden Marshall, Appellant, vs. bert B. Gordon, Sergeant t Arms of the House of presentatives of the United tates	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

his cause came on to be heard on the transcript
f the record from the District Court of the United
tates for the Southern District of New York, and
as argued by counsel. On consideration whereof,
t is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by
his Court that the final order of the said Dis-
ict Court in this cause be, and the same is here-
y, reversed with costs; and that this cause be,
nd the same is hereby, remanded to the said
District Court with directions to discharge the re-
lator from custody.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

McGoldrick Lumber Co., Appellant, vs. Charles J. Benseling, Jane Doe Benseling, Milwaukee Lumber Co., Signe Lindquist and Ebba Lindquist.	Appeal from the United States Cir- cuit Court of Ap- peals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the United States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was ar-
gued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it

is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

961	Henry G. S. Noble, as President of the New York Stock Exchange, Appellant, vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co., Calvin H. Foster, et al.	On consideration of the motion to advance these causes It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument with cases Nos. 680 and 681 per Mr. Chief Justice White.
962	Henry G. S. Noble, as President of the New York Stock Exchange, Appellant, vs. The United Telegram Co., Calvin H. Foster, et al.	
778	Willie M. Going, Administratrix of Nathan W. Going, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Norfolk & Western Railway Co.	On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion

The Cuyahoga River
Power Co.,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Northern Realty Co.
et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket, and assigned for an argument on Monday, May 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Paul Hill, Executrix
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error
Daniel Stewart et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, May 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner
William B. Poland
and Frederick William
Lee

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition

Justice White

1056 Thomas Gilcrease, Petitioner, vs. C. R. McCullough, H. B. Martin, A. E. Bradshaw and M. Brown.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1065 Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. E. W. McComas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union Pacific Railroad Company vs. Petitioner, …na E. Cook, Administra- …ix of the Estate of Paul … Cook, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of cer-
…orari herein to the Supreme Court of the State
…f Iowa, and of the argument of counsel thereupon
…ad, as well in support of as against the same,
…t is now here ordered by this Court that the said
…etition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States ex rel. Ng Doon, Yee Ngan, Ng Tin and Ng Sing, vs. Petitioners, Joseph H. Wallis, Assistant Commissioner of Immigra- …ion at the Port of New Or- …leans.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of cer-
tiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the ar-
gument of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup-
port of as against the same, it is now here or-
dered by this Court that the said petition be, and
… hereby denied. Per Mr. Chief

1020
Hugh Chambers, Trustee in Bankruptcy of E. N. Jelks, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
vs.
Continental Trust Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1043
Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Maud M. Henderson, Administratrix of the Estate of Edward C. Henderson, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 23d, 1917, continued.

1049

Joseph Hertzberg, Morris P. Alexander, Benedict Reuben, and Harry S. Goldman,
Petitioners,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

1050

Sidney J. Brooks, Receiver of San Antonio Land & Irrigation Co., Limited,
Petitioner,
vs.
Empire Trust Co. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Mount Vernon and Marshall Hall Steamboat Co. Limited, Petitioner,
vs.
John L. McKinney.

1073

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

Presbyterian Home Hospital, Doctors J. A. Moss and G. G. Buford, Petitioners,
vs.
Mary Dockery Gooch, by next friend, William D. Gooch.

1078

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

1078 Keystone Wood Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Susquehanna Boom Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

586 Franz Tempel,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to place this case on the summary docket.

119 The United States,
vs. Petitioner,
Ivar Gulbrandsen Ness

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to place this case on the summary docket.

1088 Mich. A. Myers,
vs. Petitioner,
The Union Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank C. McGirr and Mr. John M. Freeman in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel McColay in opposition thereto.

1089 Francisco Arias and Rosario Arias, the latter being represented by her guardian ad litem, Francisco Arias, Appellants, vs. Mariano Veloso, Damiana Veloso and Melchor Veloso.	Mr. Evans Browne, of counsel for the appellees, having filed in open court the following certificate to wit:

"United States of America
In the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

Francisco Arias and Rosario Arias, the latter being represented by her guardian ad litem Francisco Arias, Plaintiffs, vs. Mariano Veloso, Damiana Veloso, and Melchor Veloso. Defendants,	General Registry No. 6887 of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

Philippine Islands } SS
City of Manila }

I, Vicente Albert, Clerk of the Supreme

that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Francisco Arias and Rosario Arias, the latter being represented by her guardian *ad litem*, Francisco Arias, were plaintiffs, and Mariano Veloso, Damiana Veloso and Melchor Veloso were defendants, a final judgment was rendered by said court on the 30th day of March, 1914, in favor of the said Mariano Veloso, Damiana Veloso and Melchor Veloso, and against the said Francisco Arias and Rosario Arias, the latter being represented by her guardian *ad litem*, Francisco Arias, and that on the 21st day of September, 1916, the said Francisco Arias and Rosario Arias, the latter being represented by her guardian *ad litem*, Francisco Arias, were allowed an appeal for the review of said decision by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Seal

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name, and affix the seal of the said Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands at the City of Manila, P.I., this 28th day of February, 1917.
V. Albert,
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellants have failed to [illegible] filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court. It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

24 Original.
State of Minnesota, Complainant,
vs.
State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. Lyndon A. Smith of counsel for the complainant, leave is hereby granted to file reply in this cause.

1051.
John B. Gleason, Petitioner,
vs.
Mary C. Thaw.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gist Blair and Mr. John B. Gleason in support of the same, and Mr. Abram J. Rose and Mr. Alfred C. Petté in opposition thereto.

646.
D. M. Hiller et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Thomas B. Cunningham, Clerk, et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record, and printed arguments by Mr. R. L. Batts in support of the same, and Mr. H. D. Minor in opposition thereto.

Monday, April 23rd, 1917, continued

The City of Centralia,
vs. Petitioner,
1055 A. R. Tillson, as Receiver,
etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, Mr. Samuel H. Piles, Mr. James B. Howe and Mr. Dallas V. Halverstadt in support of the same.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours
Powder Co. et al.,
210 vs. Petitioners,
Walter E. Masland et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily per stipulation of counsel.

William W. Mitchell
et al.,
193 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
William R. Bush Con-
struction Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. B. Allen, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Edward C. Kelso, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Josephine B. Lewis,
Executrix, etc.,
197 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

200 The Toledo Railways & Light Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Walter L. Hill et al., Executors, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert Burns, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Howard S. Gans, of counsel for the defendants in error.

211 Erie Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Evelyn J. Purucker, Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. E. McBride, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. S. Kerr, of counsel for the defendant in error.

201 Norman S. Wear, impleaded sub nom. The Wear Sand Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Kansas ex rel. S. M. Brewster, Attorney General.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

161 Emilio Valdez
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. T.T. Ansberry of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday, April 24th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

Ex parte: Park Square Automobile Station, Petitioner. —— Original

Mr. Edward C. Stowe of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

361 Emilio Valdez, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. T. T. Ansberry, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General Davis counsel for the defendant in error.

Park Square Automobile Station
168 vs. Plaintiff in Error
American Locomotive Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward C. Stone, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Reginald H. Johnson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

United Copper Securities Co. et al.
203 vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Amalgamated Copper Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ferdinand E. M. Bullowa, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, Mr. Louis Marshall, of counsel for defendant in error, Adolph Lewisohn, and Mr. John A. Garver, of counsel for defendants in error, Amalgamated Copper Co. et al.

Seaboard Air Line Railway
218 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Elizabeth Blackwell

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Lamar C. Rucker, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

Tuesday April 24th, 1917, continued

241	D. B. Smith et al., vs Plaintiffs in Error Third National Exchange Bank of Sandusky, Ohio, et al.	The argument of this cause was com- menced by Mr. F. G. Morris of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, April 25th, 917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. D. Hanley it is ordered that L. H. Fisher, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that Roswell King, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Henderson, it is ordered that Patrick J. O'Brien, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moorfield Storey, it is ordered that Robert G. Dodge, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that John H. Wourms, Esquire, of Wallace, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. U. Sisson, it is ordered that Roger Montgomery, Esquire, of Tunica, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, April 25th 1917 continued

23 Original
The State of North Dakota, Complainant,
vs
The State of Minnesota.

Mr Harrison A. Bronson, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion and stipulation for the appointment of a commissioner to take the testimony in this cause.

327
Lazarus, Michel & Lazarus et al., Petitioners,
vs
W. P. G. Harding et al., Trustees, etc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the petitioners have failed to prosecute their petition for a writ of certiorari herein. Therefore, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

328
Stanley Meisukas, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
Greenough Red Ash Coal Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, per stipulation of counsel.

214. D. B. Smith et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Third National Exchange
Bank of Sandusky, Ohio, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. F. L. Morris, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. W. H. Winter, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. F. L. Morris, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

215. Farmers' Irrigation District et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The State of Nebraska on the relation of Peter O'Shea.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Fred A. Wright, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Thomas M. Morrow, of counsel for the defendant in error.

216. R. J. Darnell,
vs. Appellant,
George R. Edwards et al.
etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Roger Montgomery, of counsel for the appellant, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. James H. Flowers, of counsel for the appellees.

217. Pennsylvania Tunnel & Terminal Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Charles E. Hendrickson, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and by Mr. Albert C. Wall, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. John W. Wescott and Mr. John R. Hardin, of counsel for the defendants in error.

219 Southern Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. E. Puckett.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sanders McDaniel, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Edgar Watkins, of counsel for the defendant in error.

220 Puget Sound Traction, Light & Power Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Charles A. Reynolds et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James B. Howe, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. W. V. Tanner and Mr. Scott Z. Henderson, of counsel for the appellees.

221 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Lessee, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Albert G. Towers et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. W. Cabell Bruce, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, April 26th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Martin, it is ordered, that Rudolph Bumgardner, Esquire, of Staunton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Name changed
[illegible] to Smith on
[illegible] order
Oct 1. 1940

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert J. Hopkins, it is ordered that F. Harold Schmitt and Mark Allen, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson, it is ordered that H. Bradford Duff, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

244.
David E. Sowers et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Frank T. Johnson et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record. It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

221.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Lessee, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Albert G. Towers et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. Cabell Bruce of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. F. D. McKenney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Thursday, April 26th, 1917, continued.

223 The Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. McGrew Coal Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. James F. Green, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, of counsel for the defendant in error.

256 The Cudahy Packing Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Minnesota.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert E. Olds, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Lyndon A. Smith, of counsel for the defendant in error.

231 Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Warley.

On motion of Mr. Pendleton Beckley in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. H. R. Pollard to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

231 Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Warley.

On motion of Mr. Clayton B. Blakey in that behalf leave is hereby granted Mr. Wells H. Blodgett and others to file a brief in this cause as amici curiae.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday April 27th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

246 E. O. Ellison, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of La Moure et al.
247 David Lloyd, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of La Moure et al.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, continued, per stipulation of counsel.

231 Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Warley.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Clayton B. Blakey, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Stuart Chevalier and Mr. Pendleton Beckley, by Mr. Moorfield Storey of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

285 Illinois Surety Co.
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The John Davis Co et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Albert J. Hopkins of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William D. McKenzie and Mr. North Allen of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Monday, April 30th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael F. Phelan, it is ordered that William H. Taylor, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Samuel Doerfler and Thomas S. Dunlap, Esquires, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, it is ordered that Guy Wilson Lewis, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, it is ordered that Sargent Prentiss Freeling, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. W. Van Dyke, it is ordered that Frederick C. Fisher, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Szold, it is ordered that Frederick R. Graves, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam Rayburn, it is ordered that Chester H. Terrell, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, lor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr Edson A. Kranthoff it is ordered that
ifford Peabody Smith, Esquire, of Boston, State
Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an
ttorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was
worn accordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr L. C. Dyer, it is ordered that Theo. C. Eggers,
quire, of St Louis, State of Missouri, be admit-
d, to practice as an attorney and counsellor of
is Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ouisville & Nashville
Railroad Co. and Atlan-
ic Coast Line Railroad
o, Lessee of Georgia
Railroad and Banking
Co. et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs
W. Y. Layton

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the State
of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On con
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and ad
judged by this Court that the judgment of the
said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the
[illegible] with costs. Per Mr

Justice Clarke.

685 The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Jesse T. Moorehead

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

275 St. Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
C. A. Starbird, Administrator of the Estate of Adam Miller, deceased.

796 C. A. Starbird, Administrator of the Estate of Adam Miller, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
St. Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of

Arkansas, on writ and cross writ of error, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, on the writ of error of the Railroad Company be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and on the cross writ of Starbird, Administrator, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Day

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
577 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Olivit Brothers

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice McKenna

378

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Isaac W. Carr and Fannie G. Estes, partners, doing business as Isaac W. Carr & Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

894

G. Washington Lott,
vs. Appellant,
David W. Pittman, Sheriff of Ware County, Georgia.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the

Park Square Auto-
mobile Station,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
American Locomotive Co.

148

In Error to the Dis-
trict Court of the
United States for the
Northern District of
New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On considera-tion whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

W. S.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William W. Withnell,
M. Cecile Withnell, his
wife; Maud E. Hager
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
William R. Bush Con-
struction Co.

195

In Error to the St.
Louis Court of Ap-
peals of the State
of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by coun-sel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded

to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pennsylvania Tunnel &
Terminal Railroad Co.
217 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles E. Hendrickson et
al., State Board of Assessors,
and Edward I. Edwards,
Comptroller.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

D. M. Miller and Wm.
Miller et al.
646 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Thomas B. Crenshaw, Clerk;
W. E. Wootten, Revenue Agent;
and John C. McLemore, Clerk.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Park Square Automobile Station.
Original. Petitioner

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Park Square Automobile Station,
Original. Petitioner

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered, by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable George W. Ray, District Judge of the United States for the Northern District of New York, or whoever else may be the District Judge of said Court, before this Court at the City of Washington, on Monday, May 21st, 1917, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of the said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

27 Original

The State of North Dakota, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the complainant and the stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that Wallace B. Douglas, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby appointed the Commissioner to take and return the testimony in this cause to this Court, without findings of facts or conclusions of law; that he shall be allowed not to exceed ten dollars per diem for his compensation, together with his actual traveling and reasonable hotel expenses, an itemized statement of which shall be submitted to this Court in his final report, the payment of such compensation and expenses to be made in such manner as the Court may hereafter direct.

It is further ordered that the complainant may take testimony at such place as it may indicate between June 1, 1917, and August 1, 1917, upon giving ten days notice of the time and place to the counsel for the defendant, and that the defendant may take testimony at such place as it may indicate between August 1, 1917, and October 1, 1917, upon giving ten days notice of the time and place to the counsel for the complainant; excepting that the complainant may have an opportunity within such time above stated to present in rebuttal expert testimony in engineering and hydraulics [illegible] gard.

It is further ordered that all direct testimony of expert nature relating to engineering and hydraulics shall be taken on behalf of the complainant during the month of July, 1917, and in rebuttal immediately after the close of defendant's evidence in that regard during the month of August, 1917, and in surrebuttal immediately after the rebuttal testimony in that regard of the complainant, except as may otherwise be ordered by the Court.

It is further ordered that the complainant may take testimony in rebuttal between October 1st and October 15th, 1917, and that the defendant may take testimony in surrebuttal between October 15th, 1917 and November 1st, 1917, at such times and places as they may respectively indicate by ten days' notice to opposing counsel.

It is further ordered that the above set forth times designated for taking testimony may be varied by consent of counsel, which shall have the same effect as an order entered by this Court when entered upon the record before the Commissioner.

It is further ordered that a competent stenographer shall be furnished by each party to the Commissioner who shall be under the direction and supervision of the Commissioner, and such stenographer shall furnish four copies of the testimony as soon as possible after the taking of each portion thereof, one for each of the parties and two for the Commissioner.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

1046 Schneider Granite Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Gast Realty & Investment Co. and Emily Gast.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

536 Franz Tempel,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

79 The United States,
vs. Petitioner.
Iver Ingebretsen Ness.

On consideration of the motion to place this case on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

4831

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California [illegible] vs Petitioner Southern Pacific Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California [illegible] vs. Petitioner, Southern Pacific Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1051 John B. Gleason, Petitioner, vs. Mary C. Thaw. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well [illegible] in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1075 City of Centralia, Petitioner, vs. A. R. Titlow, as Receiver of the United States National Bank of Centralia, Washington. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1088 Mich'l A. Magone, Petitioner,
vs.
The Union Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term after the argument of the cases specially assigned for Monday, May 7, and the Court will then take a recess until Monday, May 21. No petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice will be received after Monday, June 4.

860 Joseph Friedman, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. William H. Taylor in opposition thereto

Monday, April 30th, 1917 continued

947 H. N. Johnson et al., &c., Appellants, vs. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the United States Treasury Department

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on ________ a printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and leave was granted Mr. Cornelius J. Jones to file brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

1033 Supreme Lodge of the World Loyal Order of Moose, Petitioner, vs. Thomas P. Kenney, as Administrator, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. J. Henning in support of the same.

531 The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Co., Limited, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. The Government of the Philippine Islands

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell in support of the same, and Mr. Antonio M. Opisso in

Monday, April 30th 1917 continued.

The Philippine Sugar
Estates Development Co.
Limited,
Plaintiff in Error
528. vs. and Appellant,
The Government of the
Philippine Islands.

Mr. Antonio M.
Opisso, of counsel
for the plaintiff in
error and appellant,
submitted to the con-
sideration of the
Court a motion to
amend the transcript
of the record in this cause.

J. N. M. Shimer,
1077. vs. Petitioner
Sabine W. Wister.

The petition for a writ
of certiorari herein
was submitted to the
consideration of the
Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. S. Freeman in support of the same and Mr. Thomas Stokes and Mr. George Wharton Pepper in opposition thereto.

John Kenny,
1093. vs. Petitioner
Laban Miles, et al., &c.

The petition for a
writ of certiorari here-
in was submitted to
the consideration of
the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles J. Kappler in support of the same and Mr. Charles H. Merillat in opposition thereto, and leave was granted Mr. Assistant Attorney General Todd to file brief in opposition thereto within one week, if so advised. Leave was also granted to print the transcript of the record within ten days.

2384

Ohio C. Barber
520 vs. Petitioner
The Columbia Chemical Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr Charles E. Smayer in support of the same, and Mr W. T. Holliday in opposition thereto.

1080) Ocean Steamship Co., Ltd.,
1081) vs. Petitioner,
1082) United States Steel Pro-
1083) ducts Co.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles S. Haight in support of the same, and Mr. J. Parker Kirlin in opposition thereto.

Edward N. Maul et al.
1087 vs. Petitioners
L. B. Skinner Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. M. Drennan and Mr. George C. Bedell in support of the same, and Mr. T. Hart Anderson in opposition thereto.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California,
1088 vs. Petitioner,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

printed arguments by Mr. Christopher M. Bradley in support of the same, and Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. William F. Herrin in opposition thereto.

139 The City of Englewood,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Denver & South Platte Railway Co.

The motion to vacate supersedeas in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Fred Farrar in support of the same, and Mr. L. F. Twitchell in opposition thereto.

188 William Terry,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

257 Nevada-California-Oregon Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Burrus

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James Glynn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Sardis Summerfield, and Mr. John E. Raker, of counsel for the defendant in error.

219 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Michael Tonsellito, an infant, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Albert C. Wall, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Alexander Simpson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

220 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Tonsellito

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Albert C. Wall, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Alexander Simpson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. of Texas et al.
241 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
J. H. Ward et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

The United States of America for the use of T. H. Kessler & Co.,
243 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Title Guaranty & Surety Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby continued per stipulation of counsel.

Henry L. Lanham, as Administrator, &c., et al.
245 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
J. F. McNeal.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Orion L. Rider, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. J. F. McNeal in propria persona.

American Express Co.,
248 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
United States Horse Shoe Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles T. Patterson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. W. Pitt Gifford of counsel for the

Monday, April 30th, 1917 continued

209 The Buckeye Powder Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. et al. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lyman O. Abbott, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. Frank S. Katzenbach Jr. of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Tuesday, May 1st, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen S. Mussey, it is ordered that Clare Greaves, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. M. Durrance it is ordered that William W. Hampton, Jr., Esquire, of Gainesville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, May 1st, 1917, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. E. Richardson, it is ordered that Eugene L. Culver, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. E. Cushing, it is ordered that Charles F. Taplin, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice, as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Lindsay L. Thompson, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted, to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

	H. H. Hale,	In Error to the Supreme
255	vs. Plaintiff in Error	Court of the State of
	E. W. Record.	Oklahoma

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this

[illegible]

pr. Mr. Chief Justice White

236 The Mississippi Railroad Commission et al., Appellants, vs. The Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James N. Flowers, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. B. R. Prince and Mr. Carl Fox, of counsel for the appellee.

263 Moses D. Beer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. American Express Co. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed temporarily.

269 The Buckeye Powder Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank S. Katzenbach, Jr., of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. William H. Button, of counsel for the defendants in error.

237
The State of Nebraska ex rel. Henry C. Bittenbender et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Excise Board of the City of Lincoln, Nebraska.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mrs. Ada M. Bittenbender, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. George W. Berge and Mr. C. Petrus Peterson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

252
J. Sam Rowland et al., Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas,
Appellants,
vs.
Sidney E. Boyle, as Administrator, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Joseph M. Hill, of counsel for the appellants, one hour additional time is allowed each side in the reargument of this case. The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. S. P. Freeling, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. J. F. Rhodes, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Wednesday, May 2d, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Armond W. Scott, it is ordered that C. Henri Lewis, Jr., Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fiorello H. La Guardia, it is ordered that David Gerberg Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, May 2d, 1917, continued.

283 St. Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Appellant,
vs
William F. McKnight et al., Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas, et al.

Mr. Allyn Smith, of counsel for the appellees, suggested the death of Howard H. Gallup, one of the appellees in this cause, and moved the Court to make Mrs Jennie Gallup, Executrix of the said Howard H. Gallup, deceased, a party appellee herein in place of the said Howard H. Gallup, deceased. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that Mrs Jennie Gallup, Executrix of Howard H. Gallup, deceased, be and she is hereby made a party appellee in this cause.

363 Moses D. Beer, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
American Express Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Damaso Jurado, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error
265 vs. and Appellants.
Eusebio Brice et al.

In Error to and
Appeal from the
Supreme Court of
the Philippine Islands

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record. It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause and this appeal be, and the same are hereby dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Francis C. Welch et al.,
Trustees, etc.,
268 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The City of Boston

In Error to the
Superior Court of
the State of Massachusetts

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record. It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

252	J. Sam Rowland et al., Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas, Appellants, vs. Sidney E. Boyle, as Administrator, etc., et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. T. Bledsoe, and Mr. J. M. Moore of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, of counsel for the appellants.
183	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Appellant, vs. William F. McKnight et al., Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas, et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. J. M. Moore, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Ultye Smith of counsel for the appellees.
229	Stanley Miraskas, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Greenough Red Ash Coal Co.	This cause was argued by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles W. Pierson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday May 3d, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

(Present)

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Kelley, it is ordered that James A. O'Neill, Esquire, of Ironwood, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Asa P. French, it is ordered that Francis P. Garland, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Willard F. Keeney, it is ordered that Gustave A. Wolf, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

279

The United States,
vs. Appellant,
The Board of County
Commissioners of Osage
County, Oklahoma, et al.

Appeal from the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for
the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

258

Hidekuni Iwata,
vs. Appellant,
Charles T. Connell, as
Immigration Inspector
in charge.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Louis H. Smith of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee.

288 Erie Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Henry M. Stone et al., etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Cushing, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendants in error.

284 The United States ex rel. The State of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
vs.
Hon. Aleck Boarman, Judge, U. S. District Court, etc.

Mr. Harry Gamble, of counsel for the petitioner, suggested the death of Honorable Aleck Boarman, the respondent in this cause, and moved the Court to make the Honorable George Whitfield Jack, his successor in office as Judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, the party respondent herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the Honorable George Whitfield Jack, Judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, be and he is hereby made the party respondent in this cause, in place of the Honorable Aleck Boarman, deceased.

284 The United States ex rel. The State of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
vs.
Hon. George Whitfield Jack,
Judge, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Gamble, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Henry Bernstein and Mr. Willard F. Kinney, of counsel for the respondent.

Friday May 4th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Charles Donnelly, it is ordered that Charles S. Burg, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Michael J. Phelan, it is ordered that Henry Nuckall Berry, Esquire, of Lynn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, it is ordered that Frank Smith, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rudolph B. Behrend, it is ordered that Anabel W. Gage, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis S. Gottlieb, it is ordered that John L. Bernstein, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe T. Robinson, it is ordered that Elmer J. Luddy, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

366 Grand Rapids & Indiana Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr.

Friday, May 4th, 1917 continued

James H. Campbell and Mr. Elmer M. Dunn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, and Mr. S. Milton Simpson, of counsel for the defendants in error.

267 The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States. This cause was argued by Mr. Paul Burks, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the respondent.

268 E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. Walter E. Masland et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin J. Prindle, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. George Wharton Pepper, of counsel for the respondents.

271 William E. Wall et al., Appellants, vs. Parrot Silver & Copper Co. et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Francis T. Garland, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. L. O. Evans, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, May 7th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Wayne Parker, it is ordered that Donald H. McLean, Esquire, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Charles C. Chapman, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Ralph T. Keefer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, it is ordered that Joe Crider, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that William F. Dickinson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. E. Richardson, it is ordered that Albert H. Putney, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Edwin B. Morgan, Esquire, of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that William H. Sheehan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Geo. A. Van Dyke and Coleen W. Van Dyke, Appellants, vs. W. Paul Geary, Amos W. Cole, and Frank A. Jones, Members of the Corporation Commission of the State of Arizona et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

32

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds

Gulf Colorado & Santa
Fe Railway Co.
574 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Texas Packing Co and
Wabash Railroad Co.

In Error to the Court
of Civil Appeals
Third Supreme Ju-
dicial District, State
of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Day.

North German Lloyd,
Claimant of the Steamship,
"Kronprinzessin Cecilie,"
903 vs. Petitioner
Guaranty Trust Co. of New
York and National City
Bank of New York

On writ of certiorari
to the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the First
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Chicago Life Insurance Co. and The Federal Life Insurance Co., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Preston R. Cherry. 17

In Error to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Appellate Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

721	Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, Petitioner, vs. The United States ex rel. The Fowler Car Co.	On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals with instructions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and direct it to discharge the rule and dismiss the petition.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

597	H. N. Johnson, E. B. Williams, Rebecca Bowers and Minnie Thompson, for themselves and all other persons similarly situated, Appellants, vs. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the United States Treasury Department	Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and on motion to affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

660 Joseph Friedman,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Co., Limited,
Plaintiff in Error and Appellant,
[illegible] vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error and appeal in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion

hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

321
The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Co., Limited,
Plaintiff in Error and Appellant,
vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands

On consideration of the motion to amend the transcript of record in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

589
The City of Englewood,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Denver & South Platte Railway Co.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the supersedeas in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

37
The City of Cincinnati,
Appellant,
vs.
The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

313 The Northern Ohio Traction & Light Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Ohio on the relation of Hubert C. Pontius, Prosecuting Attorney &c.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be advanced for argument at the same time as case No. 87.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

520 Ohio C. Barber, Petitioner, vs. The Columbus Chemical Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1038 Supreme Lodge of the World, Loyal Order of Moose, Petitioner, vs. Thomas P. Kenney as Administrator of the Estate of Donald A. Kenney, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

rari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1077 J. N. McShimer, Petitioner,
vs.
Sabine W. Wister

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1080 Ocean Steamship Co., Limited, Petitioner,
vs.
United States Steel Products Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as

Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1081 Ocean Steamship Co. Limited, Petitioner, vs. United States Steel Products Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1082 Ocean Steamship Co., Limited, Petitioner, vs. United States Steel Products Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by

is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1085 Ocean Steamship Co. Limited, Petitioner. vs. United States Steel Products Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1087 Edward N. Maull and Florida Citrus Supply Co. Petitioners. vs. L. B. Skinner Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

hiladelphia & Reading
ailway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
he United States.

The motion to dismiss in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the ords and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor neral Davis in support of the same, and Mr. illiam Clark Mason and Mr. Charles Heebner opposition thereto.

mmanuel J. Doyle,
ollector of Internal
evenue,
vs. Petitioner,
Mitchell Brothers
o.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor Gen-ral Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Mark Norris in opposition thereto

alph H. Cameron,
vs. Appellant,
homas F. Weedin,
egister of the United
tates Land Office,
hoenix, Arizona, et al.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, in behalf of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, having filed in open court the llowing certificate, to wit:

"District Court of the United States
For the District of Arizona
I, [illegible] Clerk of the District

Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Ralph H. Cameron was complainant, and Thomas F. Weedin, Register of the United States Land Office, Phoenix, Arizona, and John J. Birdno, Receiver of the United States Land Office, Phoenix, Arizona, and Clay Tallman, Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, were defendants, a final decree was rendered by said District Court on the 8th day of November, A. D. 1915, in favor of the said defendants, and against the said complainant; and that on the 8th day of November, A. D 1915 said complainant prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court at Phoenix, Arizona, this 1st day of May, A. D. 1917

Seal.

Mose Drachman,
Clerk.
By R. E. L. Webb,
Deputy Clerk.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause, pursuant to the 9th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity

adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona be, and the same is hereby docketed and dismissed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.
per Mr. Chief Justice White

1107 J. M. Shelton et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Gas Securities Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Irving B. Melville in support of the same and Mr. Platt Rogers and Mr. James G. Rogers in opposition thereto

832
833
834
Mateo Fajardo Cardona,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of Porto Rico

The motion to dismiss or affirm in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell in support of the same, and Mr. Willis Sweet in opposition thereto

888 Wilson D. King,
vs. Petitioner
Charles Dillingham,
Receiver &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

printed arguments by Mr. Weldon Bailey and Mr. Henry C. Cooke in support of the same and Mr. T. M. Kennerly in opposition thereto

849 Prairie Oil & Gas Co., et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Annie Carter

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. S. W. Hayes in support of the same

1096 Southern Railway Co.
vs. Petitioner.
Virginia McGinn,
Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. Walton Moore in support of the same, and Mr. Leo P. Harlow in opposition thereto.

1834 W. C. Bass et al.,
vs. Petitioners.
Mrs. M. A. Gugis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Palmer Garrett in support of the same

1111 Chin Hing
vs. Petitioner.
Henry M. White, as

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submit tion of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Pierce in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto within three days.

1088
Nicholas F. Brady et al.,
as Executors, etc.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Charles W. Anderson, late
Collector of Internal Revenue,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John M. Perry in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

270
William E. Wall et al.
Appellants,
vs.
Parrot Silver & Copper
Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. L. O. Evans and Mr. John A. Garver, of counsel for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Asa P. French, of counsel for the appellants.

273
Joe Adams et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
W. V. Tanner, Attorney
General, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Dallas V. Halverstadt, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. L. L. Thompson, of counsel for the appellees.

Monday, May 7th, 1917 continued.

276 Andrew West, Appellant, vs. Edward Rutledge Timber Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. M. Stockslager, of counsel for the appellant.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, May 8th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Samuel D. Pepper, Esquire, of Port Huron, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Joseph D. Sullivan, it is ordered that W. S. McConnaughey Esquire of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dallas V. Halverstadt it is ordered that Hance H. Cleland, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error,
1008 vs.
Lillian Wilcox, Administratrix etc.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Andrew West, Appellant,
276 vs.
Edward Rutledge Timber Co., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. L. M. Stockslager of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles Donnelly of counsel for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Alex W. Burr of counsel for the appellees

Washington Railway &
Electric Co.
526 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ann Catherine Scala,
Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. John S. Barbour, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Daniel W. O'Donoghue, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Emma F. Dorfel
et al., etc.,
571 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Luther B. Jones et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. J. J. King, of counsel for the defendants in error.

The Cuyahoga River
Power Co.,
393 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Northern Realty Co.
et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Carroll G. Walter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Wednesday, May 9th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Murray Hulbert, it is ordered that Herman B. Goodstein, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Richardson, it is ordered that Lewis R. Graham, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

342 The Cuyahoga River Power Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Northern Realty Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Carroll G. Walter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph S. Clark, of counsel for the defendants in error.

472 Paul Hill Saunders, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Daniel Shaw et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Winans Wall, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Frank L. Richardson, of counsel for the defendants in error.

The day call has been suspended for the term.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, May 21st, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter } Associate
Mahlon Pitney } Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Vernon E. West, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Warren Gard, Esquire, of Hamilton, State of Ohio; William Shafer, Esquire, of New York City; John E. Palmer, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and Cary Nelson Davis, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Arthur L. Webb, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Quinton, it is ordered that George T. McDermott and Alfred B. Crossley, Esquires, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Frank F. Ey, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Thomas F. Turner and Marvin Jones, Esquires, of Amarillo, and Thomas L. Blanton, Esquire, of Abilene, State of Texas, and Charles F. Diggs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Dana E. Brisbine, Esquire, of Faith, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Triplett, Jr. it is ordered that John H. Holt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. D. McKenney it is ordered that Ambrose G. Todd, Esquire, of New York City; William L. Symons, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Fletcher G. Flaherty, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, it is ordered that William Mayo Atkinson, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] [illegible] it is ordered

City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Terry L. Jeffords, it is ordered that William A. Hammond, Esquire, of Harpers Ferry, and W. Edgar Ludy, Esquire, of Shenandoah Junction, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Connelly it is ordered that Joseph A. Magee, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, 192. vs. W. C. Chatman.	In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

95 The Railroad Supply Co., Petitioner, vs. Elyria Iron and Steel Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Cir-

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Day did not take any part in the decision of this case.)

67 The Hart Steel Co. and Guilford S. Wood, Petitioners, vs. The Railroad Supply Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Clarke.

(Mr Justice Day did not take any part in the decision of this case.)

Patrick Sutton, Plaintiff in Error,
189 vs.
The State of New Jersey

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Brandeis

Dissenting:
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice [illegible]

190 Frank Mihm,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Jersey.
In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brewer.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Peckham

* p 308
Sup p 568 →

308 United Copper Securities Co. and Arthur P. Heinze,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Amalgamated Copper Co., Anaconda Copper Co., Adolph Lewisohn et al.
In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

168 John W. Hamer et al., Appellants,
vs.
New York Railways Co. et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

194 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James H. Barlow

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

211 D. B. Smith and Gertrude W. Smith, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Third National Exchange Bank of Sandusky, Ohio, and F. P. Zollinger

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

222 The Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. McGrew Coal Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript-of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

758 The Missouri Pacific Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edward J. McGrew and James H. McGrew, Executors of the last will and testament of James C. McGrew, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

760 The Missouri Pacific Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Margaret L. Tabor, Guardian of Harry H. Small, Grace L. Small and Margaret E. Small, minors

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

The Valley Steamship Co.,
469. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
John J. Wattawa

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Eighth District, State of Ohio

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals, Eighth District, State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

The Valley Steamship Co.,
470 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph Mraz

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Eighth District, State of Ohio

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals, Eighth District, State of Ohio and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

280
Southern Pacific Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Marie Jensen.
In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.
per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

281
Clyde Steamship Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Alfred Walker.
In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Division, Third Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Pitney
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Clarke

224 The New York Central Railroad Co., as successor to the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs
James Winfield.

In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

353 Erie Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Henry L. Winfield. In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Errors and Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Bova Hoglund. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. 265.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

744 The United States vs. Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al. — On certificate from and writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

participation in decision of this cause.)

Bultins S. Yankaus, Plaintiff in Error,
247 vs.
Moses Feltenstein and
Abraham Rosenstein

In Error to the City
Court of New York
City, State of New
York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the City Court of New York City, State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said City Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Day.

(Mr Justice Pitney concurs in the result.)

Josephine B. Lewis
Executrix of the Estate
of James Lewis deceased,
91. vs. Appellant,
The United States

Appeal from the
Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed

per Mr Justice Day

sideration or decision of this cause.

236

E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. and du Pont Fabrikoid Co., Petitioners,
vs.
Walter E. Masland et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

237

Nevada-California-Oregon Railway, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Joseph Burrus.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, and was argued by counsel. On con-

and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White
Mr. Justice Clarke.

J. Sam Rowland, William F. McKnight and Thomas E. Wood, Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas,
252. vs. Appellants,
Sidney E. Boyle as Administrator of the Estate of Wilbur F. Boyle, deceased, and The St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

179 Frank P. Chesbrough, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank T. Woodworth. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same, is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

180 Frank T. Woodworth, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank P. Chesbrough. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error — this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

310
The United States and
Interstate Commerce
Commission,
Appellants,
vs.
Illinois Central Railroad
Co.

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States
for the Eastern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to grant the motions to dismiss the petition.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

276.
Andrew West,
Appellant,
vs.
Edward Rutledge Timber
Co. and Northern Pacific
Railway Co.

Appeal from the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for
the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed, by this

Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

per Mr Justice McKenna.

200	The Toledo Railways & Light Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Walter L. Hill and Ralph L. Spotts, as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Harford B. Kirk, deceased.	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the complaint for want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

229 Stanley Weinstein,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Cavanagh Red Ash
Coal Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

248 American Express Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
United States Horse Shoe Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

251	Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Nora Gotschall, as Administratrix of the Estate of Merlin C. Gotschall, Deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

594	The Ohio River Contract Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Honorable Thomas R. Gordon, Judge, Jefferson Circuit Court.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

288 Matsumi Iwata, Appellant,
vs.
Charles T. Connell, as Immigration Inspector in Charge.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

575 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

879 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

278 Emma Taylor, Administratrix of Frank Taylor, deceased, and John P. Kirby,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Drainage District Number Fifty Six of Emmet County, Iowa, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

832	Mateo Fajardo Cardona, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of Porto Rico	In Error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

833	Mateo Fajardo Cardona, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of Porto Rico	In Error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

834	Mateo Fajardo Cardona, Plaintiff in Error vs. The People of Porto Rico	In Error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Nebraska
ex rel. Mary C. Bitten-
bender and Ada M.
Bittenbender,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Excise Board of the
City of Lincoln, Nebraska.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Nebraska.

257

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Grand Rapids & Indiana Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
The United States

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Prairie Oil and Gas Co.,
James W. Anthony, and
Charles H. Anthony,
Plaintiffs in Error,
829 vs.
Annie Carter

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

373

George Schwab, vs Zenith Steamship Co.

On certificate from and writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided in opinion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

Order

The Reporter having represented that, owing to the number of decisions at the present time, it would be impracticable to put the Reports in one volume, It is, therefore, now here ordered that he publish an additional volume in this year, pursuant to section 226 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] John Kenney, Petitioner, vs. Loban Miles and John F. Bird, Administrators of the Estate of Lah-tah-sah-homma.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

Emmanuel J. Doyle, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Mitchell Brothers Co. [illegible]

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

1055

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. C. Bass and R. T. Butler, Petitioners, vs. Mrs. M. A. Geiger. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

1054

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Nicholas F. Brady,
James C. Brady and
Central Trust Co. of
New York, as Executors
of the last Will and Testa-
ment of Anthony N. Brady,
deceased,
1183 vs. Petitioners.
Charles W. Anderson, late
Collector of Internal Revenue,
Second District of New York.

On petition for writ
of certiorari to the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Railway Co.,
1096 vs. Petitioner
Virginia McGuire, Ad-
ministratrix of Charles
McGuire, deceased.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the
Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the support of or against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1105 Wilson D. Wing,
Petitioner,
vs.
Charles Dillingham, Receiver of Houston Oil Co. of Texas et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1107 J. M. Shelton et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Gas Securities Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

[illegible] Chin Hing, Petitioner vs. Henry M. White as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of Seattle, Washington	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

58 Cheney Brothers Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 65 Ben F. Looney, Attorney General of the State of Texas, Appellant, vs. Crane Co. 56 International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al. Appellants, vs. The United States. [illegible] The United States of America Appellant, vs.	It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
324 vs. Appellant,
Reading Co. et al.

Reading Co. et al.
339 vs. Appellants,
The United States of America.

The United States of America
481 vs. Appellant,
United States Steel Corporation et al.

The United States
515 vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn for the term on Monday, June 11th next.

Ex parte In the matter of Bernard B. Selling et al. a Special Committee appointed by the Association of the Bar of the City of Detroit,
24 Original. Petitioners

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, on behalf of counsel for the petitioners, and he having moved the Court to strike the cause from the docket, On consideration thereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said cause be, and the same is hereby stricken

658 Lewis Crane Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. The motion to require the plaintiff in error to elect which of two writs of error in this cause it will prosecute, or to dismiss the writ of error from this Court was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. John S. Leahy, Mr. Irvin V. Barth, and Mr. Walter H. Saunders in opposition thereto.

878 William A. Trayler, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Edwin H. Park in opposition thereto.

782 St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al. Mr. Henry G. Herbel, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Monday, May 21st, 1917 continued

837 The Contributors to the Pennsylvania Hospital, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Philadelphia et al.

Mr. Ernest Lowengrund, of counsel for the Defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

922 North German Lloyd, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, vs. Guaranty Trust Co. of New York et al.

The motion that the mandate in this cause issue forthwith was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Walter C. Noyes, Mr. Joseph Larocque and Mr. Joseph D. Bedle in support of the same and Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, Mr. Charles R. Hickox, Mr. Edward E. Blodgett and Mr. James M. Beck in opposition thereto.

—— Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Cornelius C. Goodrich et al., Petitioners.

Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause.

938
Paul Schwarzenberg,
Petitioner
vs.
The Dollar Steamship Co. et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. William E. Richardson in support of the same, and Mr. Walter S. Penfield in opposition thereto.

601
St. Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
William Ingram

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. W. E. Richardson in support of the same, and Mr. Troy Pace in opposition thereto.

1098
H. A. A. Smith
Petitioner
vs.
The Government of the Canal Zone ex rel. William A. MacIntyre

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. William E. Richardson and Mr. Frank Feuille in support of the same.

581 Zoila Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet et al., Appellants, vs. The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation et al.

582 Joaquin Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet et al., Appellants, vs. The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation

On motion of Mr. F. C. Fisher, of counsel for the appellees, It is ordered by the Court that these causes be heard together as one case.

836 Southern Pacific Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank R. Stewart.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas Armstrong, Jr. in support of the same, and Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. William F. Herrin in opposition thereto.

29 Original Ex parte: In the matter of Bernie J. Bernhard, Petitioner.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Gillson, of counsel for the petitioner.

20 O.T. 1911 Sidney Henry et al. vs. A. B. Dick Co.

Mr. Hume & Brown, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of leave to file a bill of review in this cause in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

969 Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co., as Executor and Trustee, &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Louisville.

Mr. Swager Shirley, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1085 Central of Georgia Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. William A. Wright, Comptroller General of the State of Georgia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Lawton and Mr. T. M. Cunningham, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in support of the same.

1086 Ralph R. Blair et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. J. Dunne, Mr. Allen G. Wright, Mr. T. E. K. Cormac and Mr. F. R. Coudert in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in

1115 Union Pacific Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Erba J. Phillips, as Administratrix &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Nelson H. Loomis and Mr. Alfred G. Ellick in support of the same, and Mr. John J. Halligan and Mr. [illegible] Peterson in opposition thereto.

941 The People of the State of New York ex rel. New York and Queens Gas Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward E. McCall et al. Commissioners, &c. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark, Mr. Arthur Du Bois and Mr. George L. Coleman in support of the same, and Mr. John A. Garver in opposition thereto.

799 Jennie McCauly McMath, Administratrix &c., Appellant, vs. The United States. The motion to remand this cause for additional findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. L. T. Michener, of counsel for the appellant in support of the same. And Mr. Solicitor General Davis and

for the appellee in opposition thereto, and leave was granted counsel for the appellant to file an additional brief within three days.

Daisy B. James,
1135 vs. Petitioner
Delaware, Lackawanna
& Western Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Alexander Simpson in support of the same.

Ex parte: In the matter
of The Park Square Au-
tomobile Station.
31. Original. Petitioner

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Edward C. Stone, of counsel for the petitioner, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief within five days.

Moore Northwestern
Development Co.,
1097 vs. Petitioner,
Northwestern Commer-
cial Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr William H. Graham in support of the same, and Mr W. H. Bogle and Mr Carroll B. Graves in opposition thereto.

1126 J. Knox Greene,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James C. Denton and Mr. Frank Lee in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

1036 Large Oil Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
E. B. Howard, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank B. Burford, Mr. John H. Burford, Mr. John H. Brennan and Mr. J. B. A. Robertson of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in support of the same.

725 H. C. Jones et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Buffalo Creek Coal & Coke Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Cary N. Davis, Mr. C. W. Campbell, Mr. D. W. Brown and Mr. W. R. Lilly in support of the same, and Mr. Maynard F. Stiles in opposition thereto.

Robert D. Kinney,
vs. Petitioner

The motion for leave to file a petition for a without a duly certified copy of the record, as required by the rule was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert D. Kinney pro se.

1124 William P. Ellison, Jr.,
vs. Petitioner
Marshall E. Hagar, as Trustee &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jacob J. Lesser in support of the same, and Mr. Oscar W. Jeffrey in opposition thereto.

.... Original Ex parte: In the matter of J. S. Kilgore, Jr., et al.,
Petitioners.

Mr. W. E. Breese, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause.

[illegible] Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
John Gilbert.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Samuel Seabury and Mr. William M. Seabury in support of the same, and Mr. Pierce M. Brown in opposition thereto.

Monday, May 21st, 1917, continued.

Ex parte: In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co.,
25, Original Petitioner

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Charles C. Kramer, of counsel for the petitioner; continued by Mr. Harry W. Standidge (by special leave) in support of the return of the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Russell Mott, of counsel for the petitioner.

United Copper Securities Co., et al.,
208 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Amalgamated Copper Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion of George D. Hendrickson and Luther Martin, Jr., Receivers of the United Copper Company, to be substituted as parties plaintiffs in error in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday June 4th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Mahlon D. Kiefer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist, it is ordered that Howard L. Jamison, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 4th 1917 continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Consul, it is ordered that Gilbert A. McElroy, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that Charles A. Helsell, Esquire, of Fort Dodge, State of Iowa, Matthew W. Murphy, Esquire, of Fargo, State of North Dakota, and William H. Lyon, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. Rogers, it is ordered that Rufus Miley Weaver, Esquire, of Gettysburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, it is ordered that Leslie E. Hubbard, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Monday, June 4th, 1917, continued

Goodcell, Esquire, of San Bernardino, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew B. Duvall, it is ordered that James L. Norris, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and George D. Beattys, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Edmund R. Johnston, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King it is ordered that Willis J. Egleston, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that H. M. Whitaker, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Doyle Carmody, it is ordered that Harry Fisher White, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Alvin E. Clevinger and Herman J. Nord, Esquires, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that John Stewart Gleaton, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Donald H. McLean, it is ordered that Abe J. David, Esquire, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Henry L. Stone, it is ordered that E. Perry Thomas, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, it is ordered that Otto Bernard Linsted, Esquire, of Pierre, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jos. T. Robinson, it is ordered that C. C. Hamby, Esquire, of Prescott, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Pierce, it is ordered that Charles E. Houston, Esquire, of Wheaton, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that [illegible] Young and Lee T. Starling, Esquires, of Dallas, E. B. Reeder, Esquire, of Amarillo, Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Mississippi Railroad Commission, George R. Edwards, J. M. Sheppard, and W. B. Wilson, members thereof, et al.,
Appellants,
236 vs.
The Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The United States of America, ex rel. The State of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
241 vs.
Hon. George Whitfield Jack, Judge United States District Court, Western District of Louisiana.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

William E. Wall and
Etta Foss, Executrix of
the Will of Louis Foss,
deceased,
271 vs. Appellants,
Parrot Silver & Copper Co.
and Anaconda Copper
Mining Co.

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States for
the District of Montana

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Monday June 11th, 1917, continued

183.	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Appellant, vs. William F. McKnight, John Rowland, and George W. Bellamy, Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas, Mrs. Jennie Gallup, Executrix of Howard H. Gallup, deceased, and William J. Metcalf.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

235.	Illinois Surety Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The John Davis Co., Emma E. Babcock, George H. Bainston and Jesse B. Blackman, Executors, &c. et al.	In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

per Mr Justice Brandeis

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Van Devanter
Mr Justice McReynolds

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. of Texas, Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. and American Surety Co. of New York,
244. Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
J. H. Ward, J. R. Ward, and Houston & Texas Central Railroad Co.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

239

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Michael Tonsellito, an infant who sues by James Tonsellito, his next friend.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

240

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Tonsellito.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here or-judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Errors and Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

(Mr Justice Brandeis concurs in the result.)

[illegible] Charles Mason and A. Hanson, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States	In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska Second Division

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Second Division, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

[illegible] Western Oil Refining Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. W. Lipscomb, Clerk of the County Court of Maury County, State of Tennessee, as successor in office of W. W. Thomas, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. of Idaho, Appellant,
176 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

244 Erie Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Evelyn J. Purucker, Administratrix of Byron B. Hamilton, deceased.

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Richland County, State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals, Richland County, State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day

245 Farmers Irrigation District, William Holden et al., Board of Directors of The Farmers Irrigation District,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Nebraska on the relation of Peter O'Shea.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On con-adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day

254	Erie Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error vs Henry M. Stone and Claud Noble, partners, doing business under the name of Stone & Noble.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of Crawford County, State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of Crawford County, State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day

267	The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. Petitioner vs The United States	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Point Hill Investors, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Daniel Shaw and the Board of Drainage Commissioners of the Bayou Terre aux Boeufs Drainage District.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

472

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not

Mr. Justice Holmes

Monday, June 4th, 1917, continued

243.	Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Elizabeth Blackwell	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

392.	The Cuyahoga River Power Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Northern Realty Co. and The Northern Ohio Traction & Light Co.	In Error to the Court of Appeals, Eighth District of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

District of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Emma F. Doepel et al., heirs at law of Nellie H. Travers deceased, 71 vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Lulu B. Jones, Elmer Jones and The Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Bruno J. Bernhard, Original Petitioner	On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein

rule to show cause and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

658 Laser Grain Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. | In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

184 Albert Pick & Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Frank C. Jordan, Secretary of State of the State of California. | In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State consideration whereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.,
(8) vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Ingram

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Order

(June 16, 1913.)

It is ordered that General Order in Bankruptcy No. XXXII be amended so as to read as follows:

XXXII

Opposition to Discharge or Composition

A creditor opposing the application of a bankrupt for his discharge, or for the confirmation of a compo-

thereto on the day when the motion was
to show cause, and shall file a specifica
writing of the grounds of his opposition withi
days thereafter, unless the time shall be
so enlarged by special order of the judge.
per Mr. Chief Justice

Ex parte In the matter
of Cornelius G. Goodrich
et al.,
Original. Petitioners.

On consideration
motion for lea
file a petition
writ of prohibit
herein, It is now

dered by the Court that the said motion b
the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice

Ex parte In the matter
of J. T. Kilgore, Sr., and
L. W. Hunter,
Original. Petitioners.

On consideration
the motion f
to file a peti
writ of man
herein, It is

ordered by the Court that the said motion
the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice

Robert D. Kenney,
vs. Petitioner.
Elmer E. Rice.

On consideration
motion for lea
a petition for

...tioner herein, without
fied copy of the transcript of the record,

and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

799 Jennie McCarty Mac-Mash, Administratrix, &c., Appellant, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand for additional findings of fact herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

528 Paul Schwarzenberg, Petitioner, vs. The Dollar Steamship Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

532 The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway et al., Appellants, vs. The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d. next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

837 The Contributors to the Pennsylvania Hospital, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Philadelphia et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday October 2d. next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

969 Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co., as Executor and Trustee of the Estate of L. P. Ewald, &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Louisville, &c.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d. next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

738
H. C. Jones, H. C. Jones,
Executor, Jacob Dold,
vs. [illegible] et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Buffalo Creek Coal & Coke Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

556
Southern Pacific Co.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Francis R. Stewart.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

576
William H. Traylor
and F. W. Kettel
Appellants,
vs.
The United States, E. M.
Dorsey and N. L. Dorsey.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

909
The People of the State of
New York, ex rel. New
York and Queens Gas Co.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edward E. McCall et al.,
Commissioners constituting
The Public Service Commission
of the State of New York, for
the First District.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

1027 Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. John Gilbert. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr Chief Justice White

1030 Large Oil Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. E. B. Howard, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

per Mr Chief Justice White

1045 Central of Georgia Railway Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William A. Wright, Comptroller General of the State of Florida. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

per Mr Chief Justice White

1126 J. Knox Gowa, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

e herein to the United States Circuit Court of
ppeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argu-
ent of counsel thereupon had, as well in support
as against the same, it is now here ordered by
Court that the said petition be, and the
me is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

alph K. Starr and
omas Addis,
vs. Petitioners,
he United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of
rtiorari herein to the United States Circuit
ourt of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of
he argument of counsel thereupon had, as well
support of as against the same, it is now here
dered by this Court that the said petition be,
nd the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Maine Northwestern
Development Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
rthwestern Commer-
al Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certio-
rari herein to the United States Circuit Court of
the Ninth Circuit, and of the argu-

ment of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1098	H. A. A. Smith, Petitioner vs. The Government of the Canal Zone ex rel. William C. MacIntyre	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1115	Union Pacific Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Erba J. Phillips, as Administratrix of the Estate of Roy Chester Phillips	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the

the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1128 William C. Ellison, Jun.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Marshall S. Hagar, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of F. & D. Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1185 Daisy B. James,
Petitioner,
vs.
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1161 Motion Picture Patents Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that the order assigning this case for argument on October 2d next be, and the same is hereby, set aside.

741 The United States vs. Bessie Wildcat, a minor, et al. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing in this cause within thirty days.

171 Chicago Life Insurance Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Bertha R. Cherry. Mr. John W. Davis in behalf of Mr. Charles A. Atkinson, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion in regard to the taxation of costs in this case.

1129 Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Madden. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. S. Jenney in support of the

1035
1036
1037
1038

Western Union Telegraph Co.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Louisville & Nashville Rail-
road Co., et al.

The motions to dismiss or affirm in these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. E. Perry Thomas and Mr. Henry L. Stone in support of the same, and Mr. William M. Williams, Mr. Rush Taggart, Mr. Ray Rushton and Mr. Forney Johnston in opposition thereto.

1035
1036
1037
1038

Western Union Telegraph Co.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Louisville & Nashville Rail-
road Co. et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William M. Williams, Mr. Rush Taggart, Mr. Ray Rushton and Mr. Forney Johnston in support of the same, and Mr. E. Perry Thomas and Mr. Henry L. Stone in opposition thereto.

888

Indiana Land & Trust Co.,
et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Robert L. Owen

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson in support of the same, and Mr. W. W. Noffsinger in opposition thereto.

Monday, June 4th, 1917, continued.

Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Park & Telford, Petitioner.

Mr. Vincent P. Donihee, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

1662. W. P. Tucker, Petitioner, vs. Crawfordville State Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. C. B. Davant in support of the same, and Mr. Peter O. Knight in opposition thereto.

1162. P. C. O'Brien, County Treasurer of Cuyahoga County, Appellant, vs. John D. Rockefeller.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. E. Clevenger and Mr. W. B. Sanders in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel Doerfler and Mr. Thomas S. Dunlap in opposition thereto.

1162. P. C. O'Brien, County Treasurer of Cuyahoga County, Appellant, vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

guments by Mr. Samuel Dougher and Mr. Thomas J. Dunlap in support of the same and Mr. A. E. [illegible] and Mr. W. B. Sanders in opposition thereto.

Samuel M. Kintner, et al., Receivers, etc.,
1154 vs. Petitioners,
Atlantic Communication Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick W. Winter in support of the same, and Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Harrison F. Lyman and Mr. Harry E. Knight in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Annetta Hughes, Administratrix of the goods, chattels and credits of John F. Hughes, deceased,
— Original. Petitioner,

Mr. Benjamin Patterson, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition or mandamus in this case.

Max Jaffe et al.,
1130 vs. Petitioners,
J. A. E. Pyle, as Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George

Monday, June 11th, 1917, continued.

1118 Crew-Levick Co. vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Plaintiff in Error, — Mr. Joseph E. Kun, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1153 The Barrett Co. etc., et al. vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents. Petitioners, — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Swenarton and Mr. T. D. Merwin in support of the same.

7 Original The State of Wyoming vs. The State of Colorado et al. Complainant, — Mr. L. E. Hubbard, of counsel for the defendants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to fix a day for the reargument of this case, and the time within which to file briefs.

820 Joseph Freedman, vs. The United States. Petitioner, — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William H. Taylor in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

The State of Minnesota,
24 Original vs. Complainant,
The State of Wisconsin

On motion of Mr Charles R. Pierce, of counsel for the complainant, and in pursuance of the stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that David E. Roberts, Esquire, of Superior, Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby appointed the Commissioner to take and return the testimony in this cause to this Court, without findings of fact, or conclusions of law; that he shall be allowed not to exceed twenty dollars ($20.) per diem for his compensation, together with his actual traveling and reasonable hotel expenses, an itemized statement of which shall be submitted to this Court in his final report, the payment of such compensation and expenses to be made in such manner as the Court may hereafter direct.

It is further ordered that the complainant may take the testimony in chief at such place as it may indicate between July 5, 1917, and August 1, 1917, upon giving ten days' notice of the time and place to the counsel for the defendant, and that the defendant may take testimony at such place as it may indicate between August 1, 1917, and August 25, 1917, upon giving ten days' notice of the time and place to the counsel for the complainant;

It is further ordered that the complainant may take testimony in rebuttal between August 25th and September 15th, 1917, and that the defendant tember 15th, and October 1, 1917 at such times and places as they may respectively indicate, by ten days' notice to opposing counsel.

It is further ordered, that the above set forth times designated for taking testimony may be varied by consent of counsel, which shall have the same effect as an order entered by this Court when entered upon the record before the Commissioner.

It is further ordered that a competent stenographer shall be furnished by each party to the Commissioner, who shall be under the direction and supervision of the Commissioner, and such stenographer shall furnish four copies of the testimony as soon as possible after the taking of each portion thereof, one for each of the parties and two for the Commissioner.

Subpoenas may be issued out of any United States District Court, effective throughout the United States.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of South Dakota,
28, Original. vs. Complainant,
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. Charles R. Pierce, of counsel for the complainant, and

in pursuance of the stipulation made for the respective parties It is now here ordered by the Court that Hon. William B. Douglas be appointed Commissioner, to take and return the testimony to a conclusion of law; that such Commissioner shall be allowed not to exceed ten dollars per diem for his compensation, together with his actual traveling and reasonable hotel expenses, an itemized statement of which shall be submitted to this Court in his final report; and that he shall report to this Court a stenographic copy of testimony taken before him; that the payment of his compensation and his expenses be made in such manner as the Court may direct.

That the time of taking evidence in this action, other than such testimony taken in the action of North Dakota v. Minnesota and made applicable to this action under the stipulation hereto annexed, shall be subordinate to the time of taking evidence in said action of North Dakota vs. Minnesota (being original action No. 27 now pending before this Court); and no evidence applicable solely to this action shall be taken until all of the evidence in said action No. 27 is closed; subject to the foregoing the testimony herein shall be taken at such time and place as may be stipulated by counsel for the respective parties, which stipulation shall have the same effect as an order made by this Court when entered upon the record before the Commissioner.

A competent stenographer shall be furnished by each party to the Commissioner, who shall be under the direction and supervision of such Commissioner. Two copies of the testimony shall each portion thereof, one for the Commissioner, and one for each of the parties.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

919 William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., Petitioner, vs. International Curtis Marine Turbine Co. et al. Mr. Reeve Lewis, in behalf of counsel for the respondents, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause for hearing with cause No. 285.

1132 The Standard Gas Light Co. of the City of New York, Petitioner, vs. R. G. Packard Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John A. Garver in support of the same, and Mr. Mark Ash in opposition thereto.

855 Samuel C. Cohen, as Trustee, Petitioner, vs. Elias W. Samuels. Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

334 Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel

Monday, June 11th 1917, continued

is ordered by the Court that the mandate in this cause issue at once.

W. H. Lyon,
1143 Petitioner
vs.
John P. Bleeg,
Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas Sterling, Mr. Park Davis and Mr. C. C. Caldwell in support of the same, and Mr. C. O. Bailey and Mr. J. H. Voorhees, in opposition thereto.

The Aeolian Co.,
1149 Petitioner
vs.
Victor Talking Machine Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George D. Beattys and Mr. Archer C. Rounds in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas E. French and Mr. Emmet H. Richards in opposition thereto.

The City of Richmond,
1129 Petitioner.
vs.
Elizabeth W. Bird et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wayne Anderson in support of the same.

Frank Welch,
[illegible] Petitioner.
vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was eration of the Court by Mr. William P. Thompson in support of the same.

1146
M. F. Witte,
Petitioner,
vs.
W. A. Shelton, as U. S. Marshal, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Paul A. Ewert, Mr. Norman R. Haskell and Mr. Henry C. Lewis in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

1147
C. H. Tiedemann,
Petitioner,
vs.
W. A. Shelton, as U. S. Marshal, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Norman R. Haskell, Mr. E. C. McAdams and Mr. Henry C. Lewis in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

1113
Harriet L. Biggs,
Petitioner,
vs.
George E. Moore et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Donald H. McLean in support of the same, and Mr. Benjamin F. Cdwell in opposition thereto.

1128 Illinois Central Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr Blewett Lee and Mr W. S. Horton in support of the same, and Mr Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

888 Caleb B. Riggs et al., Petitioners, vs John J. Gillespie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hogg in support of the same.

281 Hidekuma Iwata, Appellant, vs Charles T. Connell, as Immigration Inspector in Charge.

Mr. Lewis H. Smith, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing in this cause within sixty days.

837 John Frederick Wallach et al., Petitioners, vs Cornelius K. G. Billings et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

Jacob Newman, Mr. C. H. Poppenhusen and Mr. Henry L. Stern in support of the same, and Mr. Jesse J. Ricks and Mr. Jno. F. Meagher in opposition thereto.

1112. Crane Company, Petitioner, vs. Fidelity Trust Co., Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. W. Fulton in support of the same, and Mr. Randolph W. Childs in opposition thereto.

1151. Joseph E. Wise et al., Petitioners, vs. Cornelius C. Watts et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. H. Breitheim, Mr. Calvin M. Franklin and Mr. James W. Brown in support of the same.

1151. Joseph E. Wise et al., Petitioners, vs. Cornelius C. Watts et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey and Mr. Weldon Bailey in support of the same.

1151. Joseph E. Wise et al., vs. Petitioners

On motion of Mr. William C. Prentiss in bet granted to file brief of Frank J. Duffy as *amicus curiae* in this cause.

1122 Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George W. Stamp by next friend Mary Stamp

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Robert Burrow and Mr. Isaac Harr in support of the same, and Mr. John W. Price in opposition thereto

886 Felt & Tarrant Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, vs. Burroughs Adding Machine Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry Love Clarke in support of the same, and Mr. Edward W. Rector and Mr. Robert H. Parkinson in opposition thereto

— Original Ex parte: In the matter of Dennis M. Roberts, Petitioner.

Mr. Isaac E. Lindquist, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein.

Ex parte: In the matter of Dennis Shea, Original Petitioner. Mr. Francis E. Baird of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein.

657 Joseph Henry Bash et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William Howard. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. B. Ferguson in support of the same, and Mr. P. E. Simmons in opposition thereto.

786 Empire Mill Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Blackwell Lumber Co. The motion to dismiss or affirm or modify the supersedeas in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John P. Gray in support of the same, and Mr. Charles W. Beale in opposition thereto.

1029 Omaha Baum Iron Store Co. etc., Appellant, vs. Moline Plow Co. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas A. Banning same and Mr. Otto Raymond Barnett in opposition thereto.

St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
136. vs.
Edgar E. Hodge, a minor, by his next friend, Mrs E. J. Hodge.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., Appellant,
128 vs.
W. H. McLaughlin et al. constituting The Board of Commissioners of Road Improvement District No. 8 of Lonoke County, Arkansas, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation this appeal has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	The United States of America ex relatione Auly Nagurnakta, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

937

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

504	Bert Williams et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, A. P. Sandles et al.	Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, rule 10, the Clerk reported these cases to the Court for dismissal for failure to print the transcripts of the records.
528	Idaho Hill Mining Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Harry Olson et al.	
580	Peter Marshall, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.	

Monday June 4th, 1917, continued

145 Low Yow
vs. Appellant,
Edward White Com-
missioner of Immi-
gration, etc.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, June 11th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney, Associate
James C. McReynolds, Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that W. V. Tyler, Esquire, of Millen, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway it is ordered that George A. Burr, Esquire, of Paragould, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

erick L. Fishback, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Collins, it is ordered that Thomas Joseph Bardell, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, it is ordered that W. Marcus Weatherred, Esquire, of Coleman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam T. Rayburn, it is ordered that William Frederick Duncan, Esquire, of Wylie, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Marvin Jones, it is ordered that Louis Carl Perry, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that John Charles Jones, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Wallace Greene, it is ordered that Robert Craig Greene, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Benjamin Micou, it is ordered that Rutherford Lapsley, Esquire, of Anniston, State of Alabama, and John B. Singletary, Esquire, of Bradentown, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton, it is ordered that Elbert A. Williams, Esquire, of Atkins, Frank M. Betts, Esquire, of Little Rock, and H. Thomas, Esquire, of Benton, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

by Mr. F. B. Brock, it is ordered that Lillian Brock, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, it is ordered that [illegible] Nicholson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

726 Washington Railway & Electric Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ann Catherine Scala, Administratrix of the Estate of Alan Joseph Scala, deceased.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Washington Railway & Electric Co.
826. vs. Plaintiff in Error
Anna Catherine Scala, Administratrix of the Estate of Alvin Joseph Scala, deceased.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Chief Justice White took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

American Express Co., George C. Taylor, individually and as President of The American Express Co. and Wells Fargo & Co.
902. vs. Plaintiffs in Error
The State of South Dakota ex rel. Clarence C. Caldwell as Attorney General of the State of South Dakota, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna

273 Joe Adams et al.,
vs. Appellants,
W. V. Tanner, Attorney
General of the State of
Washington, and George
H. Crandall, Prosecuting
Attorney of Spokane County,
State of Washington

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States
for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Clarke

617. Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al, constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al, Appellants, vs Louisville & Interurban Railroad Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:

Robert L. Greene, Auditor,
et al. constituting The Board
of Valuation and Assessment
for the State of Kentucky, et al.,
618 vs. Appellants,
Louisville Railway Co.

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States
for the Eastern
District of Kentucky

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Clarke.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
778 vs. Appellant,
Robert L. Greene, Auditor of Public Accounts, et al., individually and as constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment of the State of Kentucky, et al.

Robert L. Greene, Auditor of Public Accounts, et al., individually and as constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment of the State of Kentucky, et al.,
779 vs. Appellants,
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, so far as the defendants' assignments of error are concerned, be and the same is hereby affirmed, and so far as the complainant's assignments of error are concerned, be, and the same is hereby reversed, costs to be paid by the said defendants to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Clarke.

642.	Illinois Central Railroad Co., vs Appellant, Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al.	Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.
643.	Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al. vs Appellants, Illinois Central Railroad Co.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, each party to pay their own costs in this Court.

Dissenting in No 642:
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Clarke

(Mr Justice Holmes, Mr Justice Brandeis and Mr Justice Clarke concur in the result in No 643.)

644 Illinois Central Railroad Co., Appellant,
vs.
Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al.

645 Robert L. Greene, Auditor, et al., constituting The Board of Valuation and Assessment for the State of Kentucky, et al., Appellants,
vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Co.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, each party to pay their own costs in this Court.

Dissenting in No. 645:
Mr Justice Holmes,
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Clarke
(Mr Justice Holmes, Mr Justice Brandeis and Mr Justice Clarke concur in the result in No. 648.)

216	R. J. Darnell, Appellant, vs. George R. Edwards, F. M. Sheppard and W. B. Wilson, constituting The Mississippi Railroad Commission	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr Justice Pitney.

219 Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. H. E. Prescott

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White

220 Puget Sound Traction, Light & Power Co., Appellant, vs. Charles A. Reynolds, Frank R. Spinning, and Arthur A. Lewis, constituting The Public Service Commission of the State of Washington, and W. V. Tanner, Attorney General

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and

District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs.

per Mr Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr Chief Justice White
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice McReynolds

Perry G. Lanham, as
Administrator of the
Estate of Mary J. Lanham,
deceased, et al.,
245 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
J. F. McKeel.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Okla
homa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Pitney

William McCoach,
Collector of Internal Revenue
475 vs. Petitioner,
Insurance Co. of North America

On writ of certiorari
to the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Third Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White
Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Olivia H. Hopkins, Washington Butte Mining Co. a corporation and Anaconda Copper Mining Co., Appellants,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.
234 vs.	
Frank Walker, Clinton C. Clark, Louis Mason et al.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and

It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Van Devanter

The Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Co.,
176 vs. Appellant,
Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to reverse the decree of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and remand the cause to that court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Van Devanter.

Ex parte In the matter of The Indiana Transportation Co.,
25 Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition herein, the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and the writ of prohibition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Paine Lumber Co., Limited,
Gould Manufacturing Co.,
The R. McMillen Co. et al.
24 vs. Appellants,
Elbridge H. Neal, individually and as Secretary and Treasurer of The Joint District Council of New York and Vicinity of The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Pitney,
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice Van Devanter
Mr Justice McReynolds.

761 Emilio Valdez, vs Plaintiff in Error. The United States | In Error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Clarke
Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of The Park Square Automobile Station, Petitioner. 32 Original | On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, the return to cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby discharged, and that the petition for a writ of mandamus be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

764 First National Bank of Bay City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Grant Fellows, Attorney General of the State of Michigan, on the relation of Union Trust Co., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Day

Joseph Henry Bask, John Smith and John Heathany Overton, Plaintiffs in Error,
657 vs.
William Howald.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Western Union Telegraph Co. Plaintiff in Error,
1035 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Monday, June 11th, 1917, continued.

1036 Western Union Telegraph Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1037 Western Union Telegraph Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

1038 Western Union Telegraph Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., and Nashville & Decatur Railroad Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1036 Western Union Telegraph Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.	On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 11th 1917 continued

1036 Western Union Telegraph Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1037 Western Union Telegraph Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1038 Western Union Telegraph Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. and Nashville & Decatur Railroad Co.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama and of the ar thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George W. Stroup, by next friend Mary Stroup.	In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

1122

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

~~Omaha~~/Brown Iron Store Co. formerly Omaha Iron Store Co., Appellant, vs. Moline Plow Co.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

1029

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and

counsel. On consideration whereof, It is no
here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by th
that this appeal be, and the same is here
dismissed, for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice

P. C. O'Brien, County Treasurer of Cuyahoga County, Appellant, vs. John D. Rockefeller — 1102

Appeal from the United States Ci Court of Appeals the Sixth Circui

This cause came on to be heard on the t
of the record from the United States Circ
Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, an
motion to dismiss which was argued by co
On consideration whereof, It is now here ord
adjudged and decreed by this Court that t
appeal be, and the same is hereby dismiss
the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice

P. C. O'Brien, County Treasurer of Cuyahoga County, Appellant, vs. John D. Rockefeller — 1102

On considerat
the petition f
writ of certior
issue to the U
States Circuit
of Appeals for
Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of couns
thereon had, as well in support of as a

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte In the matter of Dennis M. Roberts, Petitioner. — Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte In the matter of Dennis Shea, Petitioner. — Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

786 Empire Mill Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Blackwell Lumber Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Park & Tilford, Petitioner. ..... Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Park & Tilford, Petitioner. ..... Original

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Robert M. Montgomery, Presiding Judge, and James F. Smith, Orion M. Barber, Marion De Vries, and George E. Martin, Associate Judges of the United States Court of Customs Appeals, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Tuesday, October 2nd, 1917, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Amster Hughes Co., Petitioner. ..... Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for or mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

358 Hidekuni Iwata, Appellant, vs. Charles T. Connell, as Immigration Inspector in Charge

On consideration of the motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing herein within sixty days, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

20, Oct. Term 1911 Sidney Henry et al., vs A. B. Dick Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of review herein in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

588 Samuel C. Cohen as Trustee &c. Petitioner, vs Elias W. Samuels

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1148 Crew Levick Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

419 William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., Petitioner, vs. International Curtis Marine Turbine Co., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 485, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1139 The City of Richmond, Petitioner, vs. Elizabeth W. Bird, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certio

Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

820 Joseph Freedman, Petitioner, vs. The United States

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

1062 W. P. Tucker, Petitioner, vs. Crawfordsville State Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

Monday, June 11th, 1917 continued.

1110 Indiana Land & Trust Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. Robert L. Owen. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1115 Harriet L. Briggs, Petitioner, vs. George E. Morris et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 11th, 1917, continued.

1114 Crane Company, Petitioner, vs. Fidelity Trust Co., Trustee, Washington-Oregon Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1123 Caleb B. Riggs et al., Petitioners, vs. John J. Gillespie

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1128

Illinois Central Railroad Co., Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

1129

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., Petitioner
vs.
Robert H. Madden

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

1131	Max Jaffe, Wilhelm [illegible], August Stern et al., Petitioners, vs. J. A. E. Pyle, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Stark, Miller & Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

1132	The Standard Gas Light Co. of the City of New York, Petitioner, vs. R. G. Packard Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Monday June 10th 1912 continued

1133	John Frederick Wallach et al., vs Petitioners Cornelius K. G. Billings et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

1136	Felt & Tarrant Manufacturing Co vs Petitioner Burroughs Adding Machine Co	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 11th 1917, continued.

Frank Welch,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
G. W. Ellis et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. H. Tyng,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner
John P. Bleg, Trustee
in Bankruptcy of The
Dakota Plow & Wagon
Co., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1116.

M. F. Witte, Petitioner, vs. W. A. Shelton, as United States Marshal &c., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1117

C. H. Tiedemann, Petitioner, vs. W. A. Shelton, as United States Marshal &c., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

1149 The Autopiano Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Victor Talking Machine Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

881 Joseph E. Wise, Lena J. Wise and Santa Cruz Development Co.,
vs. Petitioners,
Cornelius C. Watts et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Barrett Co. (formerly
by Barrett Manufacturing
Co.) and August C. Schulte,
1153 vs. Petitioners
Thomas Ewing, Commissioner
of Patents.

On petition for writ
of certiorari to the
United States Cir-
cuit Court of Ap-
peals for the Second
Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Samuel M. Kintner
and Halsey M. Barrett,
Receivers of National Electric
Signaling Co.
1154 vs. Petitioners
Atlantic Communication
Co. et al.

On petition for writ
of certiorari to the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for
the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

7 Original

The State of Wyoming,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of Colorado
et al.

On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the reargument of this cause and to fix time for the filing of additional briefs. It is now here ordered by the Court that this case be assigned for reargument on the first Monday in January, 1918, and that the briefs for the complainant be filed not later than September 1st next; the briefs for defendants not later than October 1st next, and the brief for the United States be filed not later than December 1st next. All briefs in reply to be filed not later than the first Monday in January next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

791

Chicago Life Insurance Co., et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Bertha R. Cherry

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error that there be taxed against the defendant in error the cost of printing the unnecessary parts of the transcript of record in this case as designated in said motion. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, the cost of said unnecessary printing to be taxed by the Clerk of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 11th, 1917 continued

642. Illinois Central Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al.

643. Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Central Railroad Co.

644. Illinois Central Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al.

645. Robert L. Greene et al., &c. et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Central Railroad Co.

On motion of Mr. Edmund F. Trabue of counsel for the Illinois Central Railroad Company, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing in these cases within sixty days.

67. The Hart Steel Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. The Railroad Supply Co.

95. The Railroad Supply Co., Petitioner, vs. Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

On motion of Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope, of counsel for The Railroad Supply Company, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing in these cases within sixty days.

1115. Union Pacific Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Esther J. Phillips, as Administratrix, etc.

Mr. A. A. Hoehling Jr. of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing in this case within sixty days. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be

The Cuyahoga River Power Co.,
893. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The Northern Realty Co. et al.

On motion of Mr. Wade H. Ellis, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing in this case within sixty days.

Order.

It is now here ordered by the Court that all the cases on the docket not decided and all the other business of the term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

VOL

19

UME

17

At the Capitol of the United States in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government, of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the first day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventeen and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-second, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice said:

The Court will receive motions for admission to the bar and other motions noticed for today and which are ready for submission, and the pursuant to the twenty sixth rule.

All motions and petitions noticed for today that are not ready for submission may be submitted tomorrow.

At the conclusion of the business of today the Court will adjourn until tomorrow at the usual hour, in order to enable it to pay its respects to the President of the United States."

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that C. M. Hanna, Esquire, of Parkersburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that Benjamin F. Harrah, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg it is ordered that Chauncey C. Colton, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Thomas L. Brock, Esquire, of Meridian, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Jordan, it is ordered that Clarke M. Rosecrantz, Esquire, of New York City, and Samuel A. Mitchell, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, it is ordered that Nathan H. Frank, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. H. R. Ewing, it is ordered that Will R. Miller, Esquire, of Franklin, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener, it is ordered that Charles J. Kelly, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter G. Gerry, it is ordered that Frank Healy, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Frank V. Barnes, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that William A. Morrow, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. D. Moore, it is ordered that Henry P. Dart, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Graham, it is ordered that Philip S. Ehrlich, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accord

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael F. Phelan, it is ordered that Harry K. Nagor and Samuel Segilman, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that C. T. Richey, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Allen, it is ordered that Alexander Johnston, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hannis Taylor, it is ordered that Palmer Pillans, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Rayburn, it is ordered that Hatton W. Sumners and A. S. Baskett, Esquires, of Dallas, State of Texas be admitted to practice as

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Burns, it is ordered that Edmund C. Strode, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay it is ordered that Harry S. Barger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. S. Tyler, it is ordered that Robert M. Ratcliffe, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, and Joseph William Sharts, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, it is ordered that E. Curtis Rouse, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.

W. King, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of
Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn
ccordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. William E. Mason, it is ordered that
Robert G. Thompson, Esquire, of Muscatine, State
f Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney
nd counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac-
ordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Fred. W.
Milverton, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of
awaii, and William Ellis Lady, Esquire, of
os Angeles, State of California, be admitted to
ractice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court,
nd they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. Sidney M. Ballou, it is ordered that Louis
Warren, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of
awaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney
nd counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
ccordingly.

motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. L. E. Jeffries, it is ordered that Henry
B. Gregory, Esquire, of Alexandria, State of

counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn acco

On motion first made to the Court in his be
by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that
B. Hammell Jr., Esquire, of Fort Worth, Sta
Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney a
counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accor

On motion first made to the Court in his beh
Mr. Lawrence Becker, it is ordered that Jame
B. Collins, Esquire, of Michigan City, State o
diana, be admitted to practice as an attorney an
counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accor

Northwestern Consolidated Milling Co., Petitioner,
458 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

The petition for a
of certiorari her
was submitted
consideration of
Court by Mr. W
Frost in support
the same.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
7 Original. vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. C. Edmund F
of counsel for the
ant, submitted to
consideration of th
Court a joint mo
of counsel to set a day certain for the hearing and
ment of this cause.

605	Mark J. Gutsch, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark J. Gutsch pro se.
1416	The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., Petitioner, vs. Hiram Chase.	On motion of Mr. Charles J. Kappler in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.
687	Horace McDonald et al., Petitioners, vs. John F. Ralston et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court [illegible] by Mr. C. W. King, in support of the same.
564	J. W. Chapman and R. P. R. Thompson, as partners, etc., Petitioners, vs. Jose Pacifico Lim et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eustace Cullinan and Mr. Thomas W. Hickey in support of the same.
301	The United States, Appellant, vs. United Shoe Machinery	Mr. F. L. Peckham, in behalf of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the

a motion to advance this cause.

427 W. T. Hendrickson,
Judge, etc.,
vs. Petitioner.
Lewis Apperson

On motion of Mr.
[illegible] in be
half leave is hereby
to file a brief as
as amicus curiae.

572. Lewis H. Stanton et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The City of Pittsburgh.

The petition for a w
certiorari herein w
mitted to the consider
of the Court by Mr.
T. Lloyd and Mr. Richard Townsend in suppo
the same.

515 Tweedie Trading Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States

The petition for a w
certiorari herein w
submitted to the consi
tion of the Court, m
ed arguments by Mr. Ferdinand E. M. Bull
and Mr. R. J. M. Bullowa in support of the s
and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assist
Attorney General Thompson in opposition there

557 Guerini Stone Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
P. J. Carlin Construction Co.

The petition for a
of certiorari herein
submitted to the co
sideration of the Cour
printed arguments by Mr. Edmund L. [illegible]
port of the same and Mr. Charles [illegible] in o
sition thereto.

553 Fred B. Jones, vs. Petitioner, Bowlin Contracting Co. Claimant, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Fayette B. Dow in support of the same, and Mr. Francis Martin in opposition thereto.

657 Peter Chelentis, vs. Petitioner, Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court, by Mr. Fayette B. Dow in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto within one week.

555 Daisy M. Linkous, Administratrix, &c., vs. Petitioner, The Virginian Railway Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Wilborn in support of the same.

689 S. D. Barrett, vs. Petitioner, The Virginian Railway Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Wilborn in support of the

556
Morris Hermann, as
surviving partner, etc.,
vs. Petitioner,
Henry Bower Chemical
Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a w
of certiorari herei
submitted to the
sideration of the
on printed argum
by Mr. Louis Mar
in support of the same and Mr. James Pepe
Mr. George Wharton Pepper in opposition the

568
International News
Service,
vs. Petitioner,
The Associated Press

The petition for a
of certiorari herei
submitted to the con
ation of the Court
printed arguments
Mr. Samuel Untermyer, Mr. Henry A. Wise, M
Louis Marshall and Mr. William A. De Ford
support of the same, and Mr. F. B. Jennings, M
Peter S. Grosscup and Mr. Winfred T. Denison in
position thereto.

570
Alfred W. Church,
vs. Appellant,
Horace M. Swetland, et al.

The motion to adv
this cause was sub
led to the considera
of the Court on pr
arguments by Mr. Hale M. Hitchings, of counsel fo
appellant, in support of the same, and Mr. Thoma
Hays, of counsel for the appellees, in opposition th

601 Midland Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Maude Ruffick, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Michener, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in support of the same.

602. Midland Valley Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Annie Bell, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Michener and Mr. Farrar L. McLain in support of the same.

687 The Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co., owner, etc., Petitioner, vs. Conners Brothers Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Pierre M. Brown in support of the same, and Mr. Mark Ash, Mr. Julius Offenbach, and Mr. H. T. Newcomb in opposition thereto, and leave was granted Mr. Peter S. Carter to file a brief for one of the respondents within one week.

565 William E. Wallace, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consid-

Mr. William A. Moreno and Mr. Roger L. Foote in support of the same, and Mr. Roberto Conrad Dunn in opposition thereto.

511 Bank of Tennessee,
vs. Petitioner,
William T. Hayden

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Cutter and Mr. O. H. Johnson in support of the same.

636. B. H. Dunn
vs. Petitioner,
Sarah J. Armstrong
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. H. and Frederick S. Tyler in support of the same.

W. L. Bruce, as Administrator, etc., et al.,
645 vs. Petitioners,
William Tobin

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, Mr. E. A. Burgess and Mr. B. F. Selinger in support of the same.

Societe Naphtes Transports,
596. vs. Petitioner,
Bliss Towboat Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery in support of the same, file brief in opposition thereto within one week.

604	New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Lowering Steamship Co., Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by

Mr. E. G. Buckland in support of the same, and Mr. Edward E. Blodgett in opposition thereto.

534	The People of Porto Rico et al., Appellants, vs. Carlos Tapia	Mr. Edward S. Bailey, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to ad-

vance this cause.

647	The People of Porto Rico et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. José Muratti.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. S. Bailey and

Mr. S. T. Ansell, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same.

609	Ada T. Cushing, Executrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John H. Whaley et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. M. Tibbetts, of

582 William R. Moore Dry Goods Co. et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Eli Brooks, bankrupt, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Watkins in support of the same.

606 Percival Wilde, as Trustee, &c., Petitioner,
vs.
Department of Education of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Irving L. Ernst in support of the same, and Mr. Terence Farley in opposition thereto.

622. Donatto Filippon, Petitioner,
vs.
Albion Vein Slate Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund F. Smith and Mr. J. Willard Raff in support of the same.

485 Clara A. Wheeler et al., Appellants,
vs.
The City and County of Denver et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James A. Marsh and Mr. Norton Montgomery in support of the same, and Mr.

Henry A. Lindsley in opposition thereto.

528 John E. Keller, vs. Petitioner, Mary H. Murray et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Hilton Jackson in support of the same.

698 P. D. Camp et al., vs. Petitioners, Morgan V. Gress

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. T. D. Savage and Mr. Thomas H. Willcox in support of the same, and Mr. Alexander S. Kernan in opposition thereto.

692. Iowa State Traveling Men's Association, vs. Petitioner, Alma M. Ruge

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas G. Rutledge and Mr. Robert A. Holland, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Lambert E. Walther in opposition thereto.

530 Safety Car Heating & Lighting Co. vs. Petitioner, Gould Coupler Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

Mr. Thomas J. Johnston, Mr. R. S. Blair and Mr. D. G. Hayes in support of the same, and Mr. William Houston Kenyon in opposition thereto.

597 Rolla D. Bird,
Petitioner,
vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Gulf Railway Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Reeder in support of the same.

584 Missouri District Telegraph Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Morris & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Rush Taggart in support of the same, and Mr. Locke M. Walter in opposition thereto.

— Original Ex parte: In the matter of John E. Reade,
Petitioner.

Mr. O. T. Richey, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* in this cause.

600 Capitol Transportation Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Cambria Steel Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank S. Masten and Mr.

Mr. Francis S. Laws, and Mr. William B. Cady in opposition thereto.

589 Ball Engineering Co., Petitioner,
vs.
J. G. White & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Homer S. Cummings and Mr. S. L. Swarts, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, counsel for The United States as joint petitioner, in support of the same, and Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett and Mr. Lewis Sperry in opposition thereto.

638 Eugene L. Younge, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Hanna and Mr. James W. Vandemont in support of the same.

548 William T. Abbott, Petitioner,
vs.
Wauchula Manufacturing & Timber Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George H. Lamar in support of the same, and Mr. James F. Glen in opposition thereto.

Monday October 1st 1917 continued

561 American Manufacturing Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Hon. George D. Reynolds et al. Judges, etc. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Shepard Barclay in support of the same.

585 Parker-Washington Co. et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The City of St. Louis to the use, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr Shep. and Barclay in support of the same, and Mr Frederick M. Judson and Mr John F. Green in opposition thereto.

337 Noah Pennoski, by his guardian, etc.,
vs. Petitioner,
Lucinda Lumski, for the use, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr R. E. Allen in support of the same, and Mr A. J. Biddison in opposition thereto.

624 New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Jon Scarlet

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argu-

Mr. Monte M. Lemann and Mr. Albert S. Bozeman of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same; and Mr. Thomas G. Farrell, of counsel for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

563	Henry R. Towne, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mark Eisner, Collector, &c.	Mr. F. D. McKenney, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the

consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

646	The New York Central Railroad Co., vs. Petitioner, Samuel Goldberg	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Charles C. Paulding in support of the same.

538	E. T. Thurston, vs. Petitioner, The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Ridout and Mr. George G. Clough in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

Monday, October 1st, 1917, continued

559 El Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Manila, Petitioner, vs. The Government of the Philippine Islands, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Evans Browne, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Thomas L. Hartigan in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel T. Ansell and Mr. Edward S. Bailey in opposition thereto.

562 The Chicago & Alton Railway Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. Pressed Steel Car Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Silas H. Strawn and Mr. John D. Black in support of the same, and Mr. Elmer H. Friedman, Mr. Andrew W. Imrie and Mr. Alfred R. Nesbitt in opposition thereto.

608 The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Elsie Westling, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alfred A. Scott, Mr. Robert Dunlap and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop in support of the same and Mr. A. M. Jackson and Mr. Conrad H. L. Ervaite in opposition thereto.

640 Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Patton and Mr. Silas H. Strawn in support of the same.

675 Gulf Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. J. P. Nelson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Evans Browne, Mr. Robert Dunlap, Mr. J. W. Terry and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas H. Franklin and Mr. Floyd McGown in opposition thereto.

777 Martiniano M. Velasco, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. Vicente Francisco Agne et al.

Mr. Evans Browne, of counsel for the defendants in error and appellees, having filed in open court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States of America
In the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

Martiniano M. Velasco, Petitioner and Appellant, vs. Vicente Francisco Agne,

R. G. No. 4719
Supreme Court, P. I.
Expediente No. 2185
Court of Land Regis-

Angeles y Reyes, Eliseo Angeles and Emilio Tomas, husband and wife, Matias de los Angeles, Marciano R. de la Guardia Barreto, Juan Bailon, Clotilde An-daya Bautista, Celedonio Bailon y Soto, Patricio Bautista, Juana Bernabé, Roberto Rodriguez Brias, Marciano Ca-brera, Ernestina, Mónica, Paulino, Clotilde and Felipe Cabrera y San Juan, Lucia Camelo y Bongon, adminis-tratrix of the estate of her deceased husband José Campo y Mantilla, J. F. Chase, Atilano de Castro, José de Castro, Cándido Concepcion, Atanacia Concepcion, Bon-ifacia Santos, Bernabé Santos, Agustina Santos, Felipe Santos, Emilia Santos, Apolonia Santos and Genero-so Santos, Isidro Concepcion, Severo Reyes, Fabian Concepcion, Januario Lim Chingping and wife, Candida Orioso, Francisco Saez Colinayco, Austin Craig as administrator of the estate of Ramon Valencia, deceased, Amado Dimayuga and Romana Dimayuga, Marcela Dealo, Severino Dealo, Severino and Marcela Dealo, Arcadia de Dios, Enrique de Dios, Martin Diaz, priest, as administrator of the corporation of the Benedictine Fathers in these Islands, Francisco Domingo, Luis Elizaga Dimaano, Ana Gomez Dimaano as guardian ad litem of the minors José Ma. Madrigal and Joaquin Ma. Madrigal, Cipriana Evangelista, Natalia Eli-zaga, José Fernandez y Ampon, Santiago Fernandez, José A. Flores, Raymundo Flores, and Dorotea Flores, Juana Garcia y Dionisio, the so-called Asociación "Gremial" (The "Gremial" Company), Estefania Gil, Gregoria Gonzalez and Encarnacion

Rosario R. Hidalgo y Padilla, Carlos Ingersoll, Jose Ituralde, Jose Javier, Angel Jose, Crisanto Jose, Raymundo Roldan Jose, Catalina, Balbino Juan Perez Jimenez, Norberto Jocson, Estanislao Kudol, Julian Villanueva Leblica, Gregorio Lazaro Feliciana de Leon, Faustino Lichauco in his own behalf and as the representative of his co-heirs Crisanto, Zacarias, Galo and Timoteo Lichauco, Doña Susana Lizárraga, La Ciudad de Manila (The City of Manila), Benito Mojica, Agapito Molina, Leandro Molina, Walter Morley, Maxima Nieva, Tomas de Ocampo, Salvador de Ocampo, Gregorio Olmedo y Garcia, Ramon Romualdo Ortiz, Benita Pacheco, Maria Barbara Padilla, Nicanor Padilla y Escobar and Ysabel Bibby y Peña, Paula, Natalia, Maria and Petrona Pereira, Doña Margarita Quintos, Manuel de los Reyes and Trinidad de los Reyes, Canuto Reyes, Mariano C. Reyes in his own behalf and in the name of his sister, Paula Reyes, and of her children, named Jose and Manuel Faustino as heirs of the deceased Vicente Faustino y Villamor, Simeon Reyes (appearing in No. 22), Elena del Rosario, Potenciana del Rosario and Pedro, Julio and Guadalupe Castro, Encarnacion Ruiz de Luis, Maria Josefa Salanova and Vicente Jose, and Maria Gonzalo, Basilio Saltino, Rafaela Santos Samaniego, Gabriel and Dionisio de los Santos, Florencio A. de los Santos, Eugenia Salvador y Padilla, Maria Sarmiento and Rafael Monserrat, Paz, Manuel, Jose and Ramon

Petronila Soriano, Vicente R. Soriano y Reyes, Elisabeth Soriano, Roberto Spalding, Isabelo Tampinco y Lacandola, Ildefonso Tambunting, D. Trinidad, N. Pardo de Tavera, Crisanto Trigo y Santos, Juliana Trinidad, Juan Valera Ang Tuaco, D. Ubaldo Tuason y Patiño, Agueda Velarde y Malabe, Luis de Vera y Velazquez, Estanislao Vergara, E. Wiegleman, Arcadio Villamaria, Justo, Manuel, Victoria and Emilia Agustin, Ignacio Villamor, Pablo Ybañez.
Opositors.

Philippine Islands } S.S.
City of Manila }

I, Vicente Albert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, do hereby certify that in the certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Martiniano M. Veloso was plaintiff and petitioner, and Vicente Francisco Agra, Ildefonso Alday, Carmen Angeles y Reyes, Claro Angeles and Emilia Isaac, husband and wife, Matias de los Angeles, Mariano R. de la Garcia Barretto, Juan Benitez, Clotilde Andaya Bautista, Celedonio Barba y Soto, Patricio Benitez, Juana Bernabe, Roberto Rodriguez Berriz, Mariano Cabrera, Ernestina, Monica, Paulino, Clotilde and Felipa Cabrera y San Juan, Josefa Casals y Burgos, administratrix of the estate of her deceased husband José Campo y Mostilla, J. T. Cruz, Abelardo de Castro, José de Castro, Candido Concepcion, Manuel Champion, Bonifacio Santos, Bernabé Santos, Agustina Santos, Felipe Santos, Emilia

Concepcion, Ignacio Reyes, Fabiana Concepcion, Jenaro Lim Chiuqueng and wife, Candida Chinco, Francisco Sanz Cortinyes, Austin Craig as administrator of the estate of Ramon Valencia, deceased, Amalia Dacanay and Romana Dacanay, Marcela Deala, Severino Deala, Severino and Marcela Deala, Arcadio de Dios, Enrique de Dios, Martin Diez, prior as administrator of the corporation of the Benedictine Fathers in these Islands, Francisco Domingo, Luis Elizaga Dumas, Ana Gomez Duran as guardian ad litem of the minors Jose Ma. Madrigal and Joaquin Ma. Madrigal, Cipriana Evangelista, Natalia Elizaga, Jose Fernandez y Ampuro, Santiago Fernando, Jose A. Flores, Raymunda Flores and Dorotea Flores, Juana Garcia y Dionisio, La Sociedad Anonima "Germinal," (The "Germinal" Company) Estefania Gil, Gregorio Gonzalez and Encarnacion Garcia, Rosario Paz and Resurreccion Hidalgo, et al, Rosario R. Hidalgo y Padilla, Carlos Ingersoll, Jose Ituralde, Jose Javier, Angel Jose, Crisanto Jose, Raymundo Jose, Catalina, Balbina and Prisca Jimenez, Norberto Joson, Estanislao Kidel, Juan Villanueva Lachica, Gregorio Lagasca, Filomena de Leon, Faustino Lichauco in his own behalf and as the representative of his co-heirs Crisanto, Francisco, Cielo and Timoteo Lichauco, Doña Almansa Lizarraga, La Ciudad de Manila (The City of Manila) Benito Mojica, Agapito Molina, Ignacio Molina, Walter Morley, Mariano Nieva, Juan de Ocampo, Salvador de

Ortiz, Benita Pacheco, Maria Barbara Padilla, Nicanor Padilla y Escobar and Ysabel Bibby y Peña, Paula, Natalia, Maria and Petrona Pereira, Doña Margarita Quintos, Manuel de los Reyes and Trinidad de los Reyes, Ernesto Reyes, Mariano C. Reyes in his own behalf and in the name of his sister, Paula Reyes, and of her children, named, Jose and Manuel Faustino as heirs of the deceased Vicente Faustino y Villena, Severa Reyes (appearing in No. 22.) Elena del Rosario, Potenciana del Rosario and Pedro, Julio and Guadalupe Castro, Encarnacion Ruiz de Alba, Maria Jorja Salamero and Vicente, Jose and Maria Cuesta, Basilio Sotteres, Ruperto Sevilla Samaniego, Gabriel and Dionisio de los Santos, Florencio A. de los Santos, Eugenia Salvador y Padilla, Maria Sarmiento and Rafael Monserrat, Paz, Manuel, Jose and Ramon Siguenza y Gonzalez, Leonardo Silos y Ramirez, Petronila Socorro, Vicente B. Soriano y Reyes, Filiberto Soriano, Roberto Spalding, Isabelo Tampinco y Lacandola, Ildefonso Tambunting, D. Trinidad N. Pardo de Tavera, Crisanto Tengco y Santos, Juliana Trinidad, Juan Valera Ang Tuaco, D. Gonzalo Tuason y Patiño, Agapito Velarde y Malcon, Lucia de Vera y Velazquez, Estanislao Vergara, E. Vinglemann, Arcadia Villanueva, Justo, Manuel, Antonio and Emilia Agustin, Fructo Villamor, and Pablo Ylang were defendants and opponents, a final judgment was rendered and a final decree entered in said court on the 6th day of December, 1906 in favor of all of the said defendants and opponents as hereinbefore

Velose, and that on the 6th day of December, 1910, said Martiniano M. Velose sued out a writ of error to said Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that on the 15th day of December, 1910, said Martiniano M. Velose was also allowed an appeal from said Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Seal

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands at Manila, P.I. this 28th day of February, 1917.
V. Albert,
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error and appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to, and the appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands be, and they are hereby docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

599 Margaret C. Harrison et al., Petitioners, vs. Florence A. Campbell et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. Bond Ritter in support of the same, and Morton Jourdan, Mr. Frederic N. Judson and Mr. B. Schumacher in opposition thereto.

595 Jacob Nettlemann, et al., Petitioners, vs. The Steamship "London" &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Brisbin in support of the same.

620 Abram H. Preman et al. Petitioners, vs. The United States of America

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach in support of the same.

642 Steamship "Pennmore," &c., Petitioner, vs. Henry Namingo Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. Charles R. Hickox in support of the same, and Mr. William Garrard in opposition thereto.

Rucker & Co., Inc.,
682 vs. Petitioner,
Sulzberger & Sons Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. D. Roger Englar in support of the same, and Mr. Paul D. Cravath and Mr. Stuart McNamara in opposition thereto.

Thomas J. Scully, Claimant, &c.,
549 vs. Petitioner,
Jacob Kazanian

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank V. Barns and Mr. James J. Macklin in support of the same, and Mr. Alexander L. Churchill and Mr. Frank Healy in opposition thereto.

Frederick Leyland & Co., Ltd., et al.,
553 vs. Petitioners,
The Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Dart, Jr., and Mr. Henry P. Dart in support of the same.

Texas & Pacific Railway Co. et al.
633 vs. Petitioners,
R. Lockwood.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

Mr. George Thompson and Mr. J. H. Coleman, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. D. J. Bennett in opposition thereto.

Robert D. Kinney,
vs. Petitioner,
Elmer E. Rice

Mr. Robert D. Kinney pro se submitted to the consideration of the Court a petition for the reconsideration of the motion denied June 4, 1917, for leave to amend the application, and a petition to amend the journal entry.

173 Ricardo Alcarate,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Mexico

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank W. Clancy in support of the same, and Mr. Edward C. Wade, Jr., and Mr. W. H. H. Llewellyn in opposition thereto.

252 & 253 The Hartford Life Insurance Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Rosa Barber.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Charles E. Morrison in support of the same, and Mr. F. W. Lehmann and James C. Jones in opposition thereto.

1
Detroit United Railway,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Detroit.

In Error to the Supreme
Court of the State of
Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

21
Kansas City Stock Yards
Co. of Missouri,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Kansas ex rel.
John S. Dawson, Attorney
General.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

135 Shill Rolling Chair Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Atlantic City

In Error to the Court
of Errors and Appeals of
the State of New Jersey.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

136. Hannah M. Clowney
trading as Smith Rolling Chairs,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Atlantic City

In Error to the Court
of Errors and Appeals
of the State of New Jersey.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

137 Thomas E. Lassiter,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Atlantic City

In Error to the Court of
Errors and Appeals of
the State of New Jersey

for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

149
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
State of Louisiana ex rel.
City of Lake Charles.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

258
Midland Valley Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Pollie Ogden, Administratrix
of the Estate of M. R. Ogden,
deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said

Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, October 2d, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter } Associate
Mahlon Pitney } Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley Houck, it is ordered that Thomas E. Latimer, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Alex. Collins, Esquire, of San Angelo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Helm Bruce, it is ordered that Louis A. Faurest, Esquire, of Elizabethtown, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry F. O'Neill, it is ordered that Harry Weinberger, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Robert J. Smith, Esquire, of Piqua, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Rutledge, it is ordered that William K. Koerner, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. La Follette, it is ordered that Herman L. Ekern, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by

Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

54	The United States, vs. Appellant, The Great Lakes Towing Co., et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

146	The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., vs. Petitioner, Hiram Chase	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file the brief of Harry L. Keefe in this cause, as amicus curiae.
365	Theodore S. Rosen et al., vs. Petitioners, The United States.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the

Court a motion to advance this cause.

Victor Pakas,
438 vs. Petitioner,
The United States

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

The United States
523 vs.
Antonio Moreno

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Charles W. Anderson, as Collector, etc.,
531 vs. Petitioner,
La Rose Consolidated Mines Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Richard T. Greene in opposition thereto

The United States of America,
393. vs. Petitioner,
The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

656 Charles E. Ruthenberg et al. Pffs in Error, vs The United States
663 Joseph F. Arver, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States
664 Alfred F. Grahl, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States
665 Otto Wangerin, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States
666 Walter Wangerin, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States
680 Louis Kramer et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs The United States
681 Louis Kramer, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States
702 Emma Goldman et al. Pffs in Error, vs The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases for joint hearing, or to set all the cases for hearing on the same day.

594. The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Biwabik Mining Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

626 Fort Smith & Western Railroad Co. et al., Appellants, vs Arthur L. Mills, Receiver, etc., et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause, or to place the cause on the summary docket.

Tuesday, October 2d, 1917, continued

487

Bob Braziel,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David B. Trammell, 2d, and Mr. Theodore Mack in support of the same.

286.

D. N. Fink et al.,
Trustees, etc.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County, Oklahoma, et al.

On motion of Mr. Edmund Lashley in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

718

The City of New Orleans et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Penn Bridge Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. D. Moore, Mr. H. Generes Dufour and Mr. Edgar H. Farrar in support of the same.

411

E. F. Kelley, Trustee, &c.,
vs. Appellant,
Thomas Gill

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced pursuant to the thirty second rule, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William B. Ogden of counsel

counsel for the appellee.

385
Mobile Towing & Wrecking Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
The Steamship San Cristobal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Palmer Pillans and Mr. Hannis Taylor in support of the same, and Mr. Gregory L. Smith in opposition thereto.

659
Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. of Texas,
vs. Petitioner,
C. A. Fiske.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert S. Garrett in support of the same.

573
Alexander H. Sands, Jr., as Trustee, etc.,
vs. Petitioner.
Fred W. Estabrook

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Granville Meyers in support of the same, and Mr. Perry D. Trafford in opposition thereto.

539
The Northern Central Railway Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Francis J. Gowen in support of the same, and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd in opposition thereto.

The People of the State
of New York,
3 Original. vs. Complainants,
The State of New Jersey
et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, January 7, 1918, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

William E. Peck & Co. (Inc.)
234 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector, &c.

On motion of Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, December 3d next.

The United States of
America, as Trustee and
Guardian, &c.
146 vs. Petitioner,
Hiram Chase.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hiram Chase pro se, and Mr. Thomas L. Sloan, of counsel for the respondent.

M. H. Smith,
337 vs. Appellant,
Interstate Commerce

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Arthur Brown, of and continued by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. Edward S. Jouett, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Wednesday, October 3d, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Alden Smith it is ordered that John M. Harris, Esquire, of Boyne City, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Gregg, it is ordered that John G. Gregg, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that Thomas H. Garry, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, it is ordered that Leonard W. Horton, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

339	Addison R. Smith, vs. Appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission	On motion of Mr. Edward S. Jewett, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby advanced for hearing in connection with case No. 337.
340	George W. Jones, vs. Appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission	
337	M. H. Smith, vs. Appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission	The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Edward S. Jewett, of counsel for the appellant.
339	Addison R. Smith, vs. Appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission	These cases were argued by Mr. Edward S. Jewett, of counsel for the appellants, and submitted on printed
340	George W. Jones, vs. Appellant,	

W. Folk, of counsel for the appellee.

City and County of
Denver et al.,
294 vs. Appellants,
The Denver Union
Water Co.
The Denver Union
Water Co.
295 vs. Appellant,
City and County of
Denver et al.

On motion of Mr. James A. Marsh, of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that three counsel be allowed to argue these causes for the City and County of Denver et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. James A. Marsh, of counsel for the City and County of Denver et al., and continued by Mr. Clayton C. Dorsey of counsel for The Denver Union Water Co. and Mr. Norton Montgomery of counsel for the City and County of Denver et al.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Thursday, October 4th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, it is ordered that Robert Browne Burkhalter, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, it is ordered that Frank E. Edgerton, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Charles L. McNary, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, it is ordered that H. W. Hutton, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney M. Ballou, it is ordered that Alexander Lindsay, Jr., Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Scott Ferris, it is ordered that Garland Biffle, Esquire, of Wetumka, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

294	City and County of Denver et al., Appellants, vs. The Denver Union Water Co.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Norton Montgomery of counsel for the City and County of Denver et al. and concluded by Mr. Edmund C. Stimson, of counsel for the City and
295	The Denver Union Water Co., Appellant, vs. City and County of Denver et al.	

Thursday, October 4th, 1917, continued.

194. The United States, Appellant,
vs.
Daniel J. Leary et al. Administrators, &c., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Marion Erwin, of counsel for the appellant, by Mr. Aubrey E. Strode, of counsel for the administrators of James D. Leary, deceased, and Mr. Abram J. Rose, of counsel for Lucius Laflin Kellogg.

110. Lee Wilson & Co., Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles T. Coleman, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, October 5th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Kramer, it is ordered that John M. Elliott, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, it is ordered that Louis R. Keenan, Esquire, of Chelsea, and Samuel R. Cutler, Esquire, of Revere, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Mr. Tom D. McKeown, it is ordered that Charles E. Dierker, Esquire, of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph F. O'Connell, it is ordered that Joseph P. Lyons and Lowell A. Mayberry, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

State of Tennessee,
—— Original Complainant,
State of Arkansas et al.

Mr. B. E. Moser, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

Ball Engineering Co.,
589 vs. Petitioner,
J. G. White & Co.

On motion of Mr. F. S. Bright, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, leave is hereby granted to file a reply brief herein.

Lee Wilson & Co.,
148 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles T. Coleman, and Mr. Henry D. Ashley, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by

300 Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Co., Appellant,
vs.
The City of Lincoln et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert Burns, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. W. M. Morning, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Monday, October 8th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Charles H. Tickt, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and Walter H. Pollak, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Francis M. Phelps, it is ordered that Robert Clay Milling, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis, it is ordered that Arthur H. Fast, Esquire, of Hutchinson, State of Kansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that James R. Pottle, Esquire, of Albany, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel R. Cutler, it is ordered that Augustine Airola, Esquire, of Revere, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. King, it is ordered that Dan B. Shields and James H. Wolfe, Esquires, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that Charles Rawlins, Esquire, of Globe, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, it is ordered that Hugh Robert Hawthorne, Esquire, of Tazewell, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay it is ordered that Ross T. Hickcox, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. McCormick, it is ordered that C. M. Curath, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Helm Bruce, it is ordered that George Gary Tabb, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hamden B. Northrop, it is ordered that Samuel B. Dabney, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accord

Monday, October 8th, 1917, continued.

173.

Ricardo Ascarate, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of New Mexico.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---- Original.

State of Tennessee, Complainant, vs. State of Arkansas et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendants returnable on Monday, January 7th, 1918.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---- Original.

Ex parte: In the matter of John E. Reade, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of _habeas corpus_ herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Robert D. Kinney, Petitioner.
Original, vs.
Elmer E. Rice

On consideration of the petition for reconsideration of motion denied June 4, 1917, or for leave to amend application, and petition for an order to amend the journal entry, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
7, Original vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of Porto Rico, Epifanio Mesa and Abram Padial, Appellants,
534 vs.
Carlos Tapia

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

363. Henry R. Towne, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mark Eisner, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Third District of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

365. Theodore S. Rosen et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.
438. Victor Pakas, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

523. The United States vs. Antonio Moreno.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

126 Fort Smith & Western Railroad Co. and Superior Savings & Trust Co., Trustee, Appellants, vs. Arthur L. Mills, Receiver of the Fort Smith & Western Railroad Co., and Virgil Bourland, U. S. District Attorney.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

656 Charles E. Ruthenberg et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.

663 Joseph F. Arver, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

664 Alfred F. Grahl, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

665 Otto Wangerin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

666 Walter Wangerin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Kramer and
Morris Becker,
680 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.
Louis Kramer,
681 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.
Emma Goldman et al.
702. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
207 vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery
Co. of New Jersey et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alfred W. Church,
570 vs. Appellant,
Horace M. Swetland et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Hartford Life Insurance Co., 53 & 253 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Rosa Barber	It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
Guerini Stone Co., 537 vs. Petitioner, P. J. Carlin Construction Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

International News Service, 558 vs. Petitioner, The Associated Press.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Mobile Towing & Wrecking Co.,
385. vs. Petitioner,
The Steamship "San Cristobal", etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bob Brazil,
487 vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

488 Northwestern Consolidated Milling Co., Petitioner, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

511 Bank of Commerce, Petitioner, vs. William T. Hayden — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

575 Tweedie Trading Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certio-

Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

528 John E. Roller, Petitioner,
vs.
Mary H. Murray et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

529 The Northern Central Railway Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

530

Safety Car Heating & Lighting Co., Petitioner, vs. Gould Coupler Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

531

Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, vs. La Rose Consolidated Mines Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 8th, 1917 continued.

Neah Parmarti, by Thomas Tiger, Guardian ad litem,
537 vs. Petitioner,
Lucinda Lumkin, for the use and benefit of Robert Fry, and Robert Fry.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. T. Thurston,
538 vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday October 8th 1917, continued.

548
William T. Abbott,
vs. Petitioner,
Wauchula Manufacturing & Timber Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

549
Thomas J. Scully
Claimant of the Barge "F. F. Chapman",
vs. Petitioner,
Jacob Kazarian.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 8th 1917 continued.

552

Fred B. Jones,
vs. Petitioner,
Bouker Contracting Co.,
Claimant of the Steamtug
"Bouker No. 2."

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Second
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

553

Frederick Leyland & Co.,
Limited, and The National
Surety Co.,
vs. Petitioners,
The Board of Commissioners
of the Port of New Orleans.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Fifth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

It is ordered that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 201, 284, 293, 348, 366, 407, 454, 252, and 253, be assigned for argument at the head of the call for Monday, November 5th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Laura Eichel et al.,
571 vs. Appellants,
United States Fidelity
& Guaranty Co.

Mr. William M. Hall, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Laura Eichel et al.,
571 vs. Appellants,
United States Fidelity
& Guaranty Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. B. M. Ambler in support of the motion, and Mr. William M. Hall in opposition thereto.

City of Chelsea,
236 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Boston.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John A. Sullivan and Mr. Joseph P. Lyons in support of

Kiernan and Mr. Samuel R. Cutler in opposition thereto.

363 Boston Store of Chicago,
vs.
American Graphophone Co.
et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, of counsel for the Boston Store of Chicago, in support of the same, and by Mr. Charles R. Camp, of counsel for the American Graphophone Co. et al, in opposition thereto.

719 The Planters' Steamship Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Rolf Seeberg Ship Chandlery
Co., Claimant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. John D. Grace in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

707 Barnes-Ames Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
W. & C. T. Jones Steamship
Co. (Ltd.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Haight and Mr. John W. Griffin in support of the same.

733 International Paper Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

734 The Locomobile Co. of America
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, and Mr. Henry C. Attwill, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases to be heard with that of Cheney Brothers Co. et al. vs. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, No. 12 on the docket for the present term, as one case.

691 Richard Watson, Master, &c., et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Mattea Kruszewski, Administratrix, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Forbes in support of the same.

1133 Oct. Term 1916. John Frederick Wallach et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Cornelius K. G. Billings et al.

Mr. Edward R. Johnston in behalf of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing in this cause.

119 Edmundo Ricaud et al.
vs.
The American Metal Co.,

On motion of Mr. Duane E. Fox in behalf of Mr. Charles D. Hoyt, Mr.

Mr. Fred R. Wright, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amici curiae.

The City of New Orleans
et al.
718 vs. Petitioners,
Penn Bridge Co.

On motion of Mr. R. E. Milling, of counsel for the respondent leave is hereby granted to file brief in opposition to the petition for certiorari in this cause.

Pocahontas Consolidated
Collieries Co. (Inc.),
723. vs. Petitioner,
T. L. Johnson, Administrator, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Robert Hawthorne, and Mr. S. C. Graham in support of the same.

J. M. Kellogg, Executor,
, etc.,
619 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Miss Letitia King, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William H. Whitlock in support of the same, and Mr. E. F. Noel in opposition thereto.

Lincoln Gas & Electric
Light Co.,
300 vs. Appellant,
The City of Lincoln et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson, of counsel for the appellant

Monday, October 8th, 1917, continued.

E. C. Steele, of counsel for the appellant.

The Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
416 vs. Appellant,
State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.
State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.,
1445 vs. Appellants,
The United States et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, of counsel for the Railroad Companies, and continued by Mr. George T. Buckingham, of counsel for the State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al., and Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Tuesday, October 9th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Robert D. Vance, Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, it is ordered that George L. Haid and James C. Jones, Jr., Esquires, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

by Mr Robert B. Brown, it is ordered that Wilfred Otto Gunner, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William E. Peck, & Co.,
Incorporated,
234 vs. Plaintiff in Error
John Z. Lowe, Jr. Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next, at the head of the call for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.,
197 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George D. Fish

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Adah B. Walton,
Administratrix of the
Estate of James R.
Walton, deceased
547 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edward B. Pryor and
Edward F. Kearney, Receivers
of The Wabash Railroad Co.

In Error to the Supreme
Court of the State of
Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
416 vs. Appellant,
State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.
State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.,
1118 vs. Appellants.
The United States et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Joseph W. Folk of counsel for the Inter State Commerce Commission, Mr. James H. Wilkerson, of counsel for the State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al., and concluded by Mr. Robert Bruce Scott of counsel for the Illinois Central Railroad Co. The cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for The United States

7 Original. The State of Arkansas, Complainant, vs. The State of Tennessee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Caruthers Ewing, of counsel for the complainant, and Mr. G. T. Fitzhugh, of counsel for the defendant.

20 W. A. Cissna, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Tennessee.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Caruthers Ewing, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, October 10th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, it is ordered that Charles R. Frankham, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

20 W. A. Cissna, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Tennessee.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Caruthers Ewing of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John P. Bullington, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Caruthers Ewing of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

426 Guy B. Biddinger, Appellant, vs. The Commissioner of Police of the City of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter H. Pollak, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. Robert L. Johnstone, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. Walter H. Pollak, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, October 11th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Dutton, it is ordered that S. A. Gilbert Cox, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

426	Guy B. Biddinger, Appellant vs. The Commissioner of Police of the City of New York.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter H. Pollak of counsel for the appellant.

427	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., vs. Petitioner, Louis Apperson.	These cases were argued by Mr. Helm Bruce, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. L. A. Faurest, of counsel for the respondents.
428	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., vs. Petitioner, Elizabeth Creager.	
429	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., vs. Petitioner, Hugh S. Gardner.	
430	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., vs. Petitioner, Mildred E. Hocker.	
431	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge, &c., vs. Petitioner, Sterling Land & Investment Co.	

473. Gast Realty & Investment Co., et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Schneider Granite Co.

On motion of Mr. Thomas G. Rutledge, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced for argument with case No. 461.

461	Schneider Granite Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Hickman P. Rodgers, of counsel for the Schneider Granite Company, and contin-
473	Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Schneider Granite Co.	

C. Rutledge, of counsel for the Coast Realty and Investment Company et al.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Friday, October 12th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. McCormick, it is ordered that Benjamin S. Ohnick, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

157 Frank R. Williams, Appellant, vs. Charles Potter et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here or-

appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.
per Mr. Justice McKenna.

2. The State ex rel. Willie J. Roussel, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jared Y. Sanders, Governor, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

3. Tremont Lumber Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs Nora Reagan et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John C. Theus of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. S. D. Pearce and Mr. H. Garland Dupré, of counsel for the defendant in error.

461 Schneider Granite Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al.

473 Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Schneider Granite Co.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. David Goldsmith, of counsel for the Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al., and concluded by Mr. William R. Kinsey, of counsel for the Schneider Granite Co.

Friday October 12th 1917 continued

192	Paul Schwarzenberg, Petitioner, vs. The Dollar Steamship Co. et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. H. W. Hutton, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Nathan H. Frank, of counsel for the respondents.
199	The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry G. Herbel, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, October 15th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Charles W. Savage, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles T. Tittmann it is ordered that Phillips Ketchum, Esquire, of Brookline, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Hegarty, it is ordered that Jeremiah A. Costello, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy B. Mills it is ordered that Fred Gerlach, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that J. D. Dresner, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Clements it is ordered that Sydney Smith, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie E. Hubbard, it is ordered that Frank McLaughlin, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Park, it is ordered that Albert S. Anderson, Esquire, of Millen, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hickton B. Fisher, it is ordered that Paul Atlee Walker, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, it is ordered that Edwin B. Mayer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert C. Pontius, it is ordered that Frank N. Sweitzer, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Lessee of the Northern Central Railway Co., vs Plaintiff in Error, Albert G. Towers, E. Clay Timanus and W. Laird Henry, constituting The Public Service Commission of Maryland	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

31

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Dissenting: [illegible] Chief Justice White [illegible]

per Mr. Justice Day.

The United States, vs Appellant, Daniel J. Leary and George Leary, Administrators of James D. Leary, deceased, Judith Loftin Kellogg and The Norfolk & Western Railway Co.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

198

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Tremont Lumber Co.
3 vs. Plaintiff in Error. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of
Mrs Nora Reagan Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

City of Chelsea,
236. vs. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the
City of Boston. State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and the motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clara A. Wheeler and Frank S. Lusk, 485 vs. Appellants, The City and County of Denver et al.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. M. Kellogg, Executor of the Estate of Mrs. Mary N. Miller, deceased, 619 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mrs. Letitia King, Administratrix, of the Estate of Charles L. King	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss or affirm.

whereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1183 [illegible]

John Frederick Wallach et al., Petitioners,
vs
Cornelius K. G. Billings et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to present a petition for rehearing herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

363

Boston Store of Chicago,
vs
American Graphophone Co et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

733

International Paper Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

734

The Locomobile Co. of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for argument with case No. 12, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the

587 Wall Engineering Co., vs. Petitioner, J. G. White & Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

597 The United States of America, vs. Petitioner. The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

594. The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Bunker Mining Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

600. Capitol Transportation Co., Petitioner, vs. Cambria Steel Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

623. Donato Filippone, Petitioner, vs. Albion Vein Slate Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Texas & Pacific Railway Co. and Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway of Texas, Petitioners, vs B. Leatherwood.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

632.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Daisy M. Linkous, Administratrix of J. M. Linkous, deceased, Petitioner, vs The Virginian Railway Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

355

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered,

same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Morris Hermann, as surviving partner of Morris Hermann & Co.,
Petitioner,
556 vs.
Henry Bower Chemical Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

El Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Manila,
Petitioner,
557 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands, represented by the Treasurer of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as

here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

American Manufacturing Company, vs. Petitioner, Hon. George D. Reynolds, et al., Judges of the St. Louis Court of Appeals and Louis Ott.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

361

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

J. W. Chapman and T. R. Thompson, copartners doing business under the firm name of Chapman & Thompson, vs. Petitioners, Java Pacific Line, Claimant of vessel-steamship Noordland et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

366

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

565 William E. Wallace, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

57 Lewis H. Stanton, Charles E. Hutchinson, et al, Petitioners,
vs.
The City of Pittsburgh.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

575 Alan H. Sands, Jr., as
Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Summit Dredging Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Frank W. Estabrook.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Second
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

582 William R. Moore
Dry Goods Co., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Cole Brooks, Bankrupt,
and J. M. Jameson, Trustee.

On petition for a writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

582 Missouri District Telegraph Co., Petitioner, vs. Morris & Company — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

585 Parker-Washington Co. and Title Guaranty & Surety Co. of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Petitioners, vs. The City of St. Louis to the use of Carroll-Porter Boiler & Tank Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

562

The Chicago & Alton Railway Co. and The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Pressed Steel Car Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

585

Jacob Willumsen and Michael Jorgensen,
Petitioners,
vs.
The Steamship "London" Christian Larsen, Master.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

596.
Societa Napoletana Trasporti,
vs. Petitioner,
Bisso Towboat Co and Cuneo
Steamship Co., Limited.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Fifth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

597
Rolla DuBord,
vs. Petitioner,
Chicago, Rock Island
& Gulf Railway Co.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the Supreme
Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

599 Margaret C. Harrison et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Florence A. Campbell, Lois Ann Burnham et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

621 Midland Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mrs. Maude Griffith, Administratrix of the Estate of Elmer B. Griffith Deceased

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Midland Valley Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Annie Bell, Administratrix of the Estate of John Bell, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

601 New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Lansing Steamship Co., Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

685 Mary J. Gutsch,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

686 Percival Wilds, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Midtown Contracting Co., Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
vs.
Department of Education of the City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Atchison, Topeka
& Santa Fe Railway Co.,
608 vs. Petitioner,
Elsie Westling, Administratrix of the Estate of Charles Westling, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Abram H. Freeman et al.,
620 vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

524 New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Joe Scarlet.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 22d. instant to Monday, November 5th next.

584 J. Knox Green, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

575 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward Bathgate et al.

576 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John J. Buckhanan et al.

577 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harry Cramer et al.

The United States of America,

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

579 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Otto Mayer et al.

580 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Robert Urisho et al.

738 Albert Jones, Appellant,
vs.
H. W. Perkins, Deputy United States Marshal, et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case for hearing with the other draft law cases.

Hartford Beaumont, Assignee of W. Borck, Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mauro Prieto et al.

Mr. Henry W. Van Dyke, of counsel for the appellees and defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to docket and dismiss this cause.

588 Woo Ty, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. W. Savage and Mr. Thomas Dunlap in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant opposition thereto.

391
The Railroad Commission of the State of California,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Mr. Max Thelen of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

762
The Port of Portland,
Petitioner,
vs.
Wilhelm Wilhelmsen, Owner etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph N. Teal and Mr. Wirt Minor in support of the same, and Mr. William C. Bristol in opposition thereto.

733
International Paper Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. Charles F. Wittman, in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file the brief of Malcolm Donald as amicus curiae in this cause.

727
Ramona Gauzon,
Appellant and
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record ments by Mr. F. C. Fisher in support of the same, and Mr. F. H. Clements, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne in opposition thereto.

710

Sundh Electric Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Cutler-Hammer Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Albert C. Wall in support of the same, and Mr. M. Clyde Jones in opposition thereto.

711

Sundh Electric Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
General Electric Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Albert C. Wall in support of the same, and Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Charles Neave, and Mr. Albert G. Davis in opposition thereto.

720

United Metals Selling Co.
vs. Petitioner,
Edward B. Pryor et al., as Receivers &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Garver in support of the same.

Monday, October 15th, 1917 continued

731 A. B. K. Pettingill, Petitioner, vs. Walter McK. Jones.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. B. K. Pettingill pro se, and Mr. Francis E. Neagle and Mr. Woodward Emery in opposition thereto.

728 The Liberal Elevator Co., Petitioner, vs. The Wichita Mill & Elevator Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. F. Holladay and Mr. C. M. Williams in support of the same, and Mr. Chester I. Long in opposition thereto.

695. Theodore Dandinger, Petitioner, vs. Arthur L. Bowe, Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Dresser and Mr. Henry Mooney in support of the same.

757 William Bartels, Petitioner, vs. The Strathblane Steamship Co. (Ltd.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Robert N. Talley in support of the same, and

653 Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Mrs. Clara J. Mullins, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch and Mr. H. D. Minor, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same.

533 New York Scaffolding Co., Petitioner, vs. Egbert Whitney

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank Chase Somes in support of the same and Mr. Robert H. Parkinson and Mr. Wallace R. Lane in opposition thereto.

712 New York Scaffolding Co., Petitioner, vs. Leibel, Binney Construction Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank Chase Somes in support of the same and Mr. Robert H. Parkinson and Mr. Wallace R. Lane in opposition thereto.

713. New York Scaffolding Co., Petitioner, vs. Chain Belt Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

in support of the same, and Mr. Robert H. Parkinson and Mr. William R. Lane in opposition thereto.

561 Edward M. Blum,
vs Petitioner,
The Bunnelle Remelin Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George B. Parkinson in support of the same, and Mr. Charles L. Sturtevant in opposition thereto.

616 Corrugated Bar Co.,
vs Petitioner,
Trussed Concrete Steel Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James A. Carr in support of the same, and Mr. Fred L. Chappell in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Bob Terrell,
vs Petitioner,
The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Denton and Mr. Guy H. Sigler in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

585 Harry M. Stone, Guardian, &c.,
vs Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas W. P. Stone, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was sub-ration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Moses N. Amis and Mr. Robert W. Winston in support of the same, and Mr. Murray Allen, Mr. William C. Douglass and Mr. Clyde A. Douglass in opposition thereto.

7\.
The St. Louis Poster Advertising Co.,
vs. Appellant,
City of St. Louis et al.

On motion of Mr. Harry A. Hegarty in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, to be heard with case No. 566.

8\.
Daniel J. Leary,
vs. Appellant,
The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Jersey City et al.

On motion of Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

9\.
The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Harvey C. Shauver.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

193

The St. Louis South-
western Railway Co. et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause, was continued by Mr. Henry G. Herbel, of counsel for the appellants, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for the United States, and Mr. C. W. Needham, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission; and concluded by Mr. Henry G. Herbel, of counsel for the appellants.

20 Original

Ex parte: In the matter
of Park & Tilford,
Petitioner.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Vincent P. Donihee, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, October 16th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Lawrence B. Cohen, it is ordered that Adolph Berkowitz, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

686 The City of Chicago, Petitioner,
vs.
White Transportation Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Chester E. Cleveland in support of the same.

28 P. J. Hamill, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the Tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

14 International Harvester Co. of New Jersey et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. — On motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.

24 Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Paul W. Telford, Petitioner. — The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the respondents.

349. The Contributors to the Pennsylvania Hospital, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Philadelphia et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. John P. Connelly and Mr. Ernest Lowengrund, of counsel for the defendants in error.

424. Fidelity and Columbia Trust Co. as Executor, &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Louisville.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William W. Crawford, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Pendleton Beckley and Mr. George Cary Tabb, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Wednesday October 17th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that David M. Picton Jr., Esquire, of Corpus Christi, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. E. Weadock, it is ordered that John F. McKinlay, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. F. B. Brock, it is ordered that Axel V. Beeken, Esquire, of Bloomfield, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Charles A. Gross, it is ordered that Saul Zielonka, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

B. V. Moore,
280 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Walter C. Taylor, Commissioner of Insurance,
etc., et al.

Mr. William Langer, of counsel for the defendants in error, suggested the expiration of the terms of office of Walter C. Taylor, as Commissioner of Insurance and of G. J. Johnson, as State Examiner, of the State of North Dakota, and moved the Court to substitute S. A. Olsness, as Commissioner of Insurance, and J. R. Waters, as State Examiner of the State of North Dakota, as parties defendants in error in this cause. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that S. A. Olsness, as Commissioner of Insurance, and J. R. Waters, as State Examiner, of the State of North Dakota, be, and they are hereby made parties defendants in error herein in place of the said Walter C. Taylor and G. J. Johnson, as such officers respectively.

280

B. V. Moore,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
S. A. Olsness, Commissioner of Insurance, et al.

The motion to require an additional supersedeas bond or to vacate stay herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Langer in support of the same, and Mr. Aubrey Lawrence in opposition thereto.

280

B. V. Moore,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
S. A. Olsness, Commissioner of Insurance, et al.

The motions to dismiss or affirm or to advance in this cause were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Langer in support of the same, and Mr. Aubrey Lawrence in opposition thereto.

65

The Keetoowah Society et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal missed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

424

Fidelity and Columbia
Trust Co., as Executor, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Louisville.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George Cary Tabb, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William W. Crawford, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

359.

Samuel C. Cohen, as
Trustee, etc.,
vs. Petitioner,
Elias W. Samuels.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence B. Cohen, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Samuel Sturtz, of counsel for the respondent.

499

Ernst Levick Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause was argued by Mr. David Wallerstein, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Joseph L. Kun, of counsel for the defendant in error.

4

C. J. Olson,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of North Dakota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of North Dakota, and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his writ of error, and failing to appear, it is thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. William Langer, of counsel for the defendant in error, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

10	The City of Cincinnati, Appellant, vs. The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co., et al.	The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Groom, of counsel for the appellant

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, October 18th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, it is ordered that Herbert S. Phillips, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. J. W. Morgan, it is ordered that Samuel M. Clement, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and Robert N. Sykes, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Thursday, October 18th, 1917, continued.

187. Elisa Shardlund, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Tax Commission of the State of North Dakota. — Mr. William Langer, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

28. Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas on the relation of S. M. Brewster, Attorney General, et al. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Paul E. Walker, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James P. Coleman and Mr. J. C. Lindsey, of counsel for the defendants in error.

29. The Salt Lake Investment Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed.

30. The City of Cincinnati, Appellant, vs. The Cincinnati and Hamilton Traction Co., et al. — The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles A. Groom, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of

60

The Northern Ohio Traction and Light Co. et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Ohio on the relation of Hubert C. Pontius,
Prosecuting Attorney, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John C. Welty, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. Frank A. [illegible] and Mr. Hubert C. Pontius, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Friday, October 19th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. Cureton, it is ordered that Alvin M. Owsley, Esquire, of Denton, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Quinton, it is ordered that William Easton Hutchison, Esquire, of Garden City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

Friday, October 19th, 1917 continued

that George Philip, Esquire, of Rapid City, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Drayton, it is ordered that Garner W. Green, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

60	The Northern Ohio Traction and Light Co., et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The State of Ohio on the relation of Hubert C. Pontius, Prosecuting Attorney, &c.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Hubert C. Pontius, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph S. Clark, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.
12	Cheney Brothers Co., et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts	The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Snow, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, of counsel
733	International Paper Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts	
734	Locomobile Co. of America, vs. Plaintiff in Error,	

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 22d, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Charles D. Lockwood, Esquire, of Stamford, State of Connecticut; Albert H. Miller, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio; and Everett Delaney Ott, Esquire, of Harrisonburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher it is ordered that Samuel Pasco, Esquire, of Pensacola, and John B. Sutton, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. Hargest, it is ordered that William M. Hain, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. P. Loring it is ordered that Lunsford Loring Hamner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Frank S. Roberts, Esquire, of Lockhart, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. L. Bruce, as Administrator of the Estate of John T. Tobin, deceased, and Catherine Tobin, Petitioners, vs. William Tobin.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

643

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

504. J. Knox Green,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

591. The Railroad Commission of the State of California,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

523. Carry W. Stone, Guardian, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Emmett P. Stone, next friend of Thomas J. Stone.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

738. Albert Jones,
vs. Appellant,
R. W. Perkins, Deputy United States Marshal, and M. C. White, Jailor of Richmond County, Georgia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned

575 The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edmund Bathgate, Matthew Peacock, John Foster et al.

576 The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John J. Burckhauser, Philip Boehler, Al. Bunkey et al.

577. The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Henry Coons, John Otto, Joseph Miller et al.

578 The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Farrell, Peter McLong, John Long et al.

579 The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Otto Klayer, Charles Hamburger, Joseph Emmy et al.

580 The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Robert Urinke, John Ryan, Frank Ream et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

567 Elvin S. Knudsend,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Tax Commissioner of the State of North Dakota.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said be now assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alice T. Cushing, Executrix of the Estate of Frederic J. Cushing, deceased,
629 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John H. Whaley, Mary E. Whaley, The American Trust Co. et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby postponed to the hearing on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.,
648 vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

646 The New York Central Railroad Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Samuel Goldberg.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

647 The People of Porto Rico and Charles E. Foote, Judge of the District Court of Mayaguez,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Jose Muratti

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted, the transcript of the record heretofore filed on the writ of error to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

657 Peter Chelentis,
Petitioner,
vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

698	P. D. Camp, P. R. Camp and John M. Camp, Petitioners, vs. Morgan W. Gress.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

616	B. N. Dana, Petitioner, vs. Sarah J. Armstrong et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby

637.	The Moran Dry Dock & Repair Co., Owner of the Steamship "Oceana", Petitioner, vs. Conron Brothers Co. et al	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

638	Eugene L. Younge, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Steamship "Dunmore" Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Dunmore",	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
642	vs. Petitioner,	
	Henry Hamminga Co. et al.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

	Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. of Texas,	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, of the State of Texas.
635	vs. Petitioner,	
	C. A. Fink	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co. and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.,
Petitioners,
675 vs.
J. P. Nelson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Barber & Co., Inc.,
682. vs. Petitioner,
Sulzberger & Sons Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

687

Horace McDonald and F. A. Rittenhouse, Petitioners,
vs.
John F. Ralston and J. A. D. McDonnell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

692.

Iowa State Traveling Men's Association, Petitioner,
vs.
Alma M. Ruge.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday October 22d, 1917 continued

718 The City of New Orleans and The New Orleans Railway & Light Co., Petitioners, vs Penn Bridge Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

691 Richard Watson, Master of the British Steamship "Student," and Charente Steamship Co., Limited, and T. & J. Harrison, owners, Petitioners, vs. Mattie Krzyzewski, Administratrix of Kasimir Krzyzewski, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

717

Barnes Arms Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
W. & C. T. Jones Steamship Co. Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

723

Pocahontas Consolidated Collieries Co., Inc.,
vs. Petitioner.
F. L. Johnson, Administrator of J. D. Ross, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

586

The United States of America, ex rel.
vs.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for

America, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

716 George Ostrow et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Abraham Aronson
et al. etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Francis B. James and Mr. Edward J. McClernan in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel Seligman in opposition thereto.

722 Ella Getkin,
vs. Petitioner,
The Pennsylvania
Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Hargest and Mr. William M. Hain in support of the same.

655 F. F. Doane,
vs. Petitioner,
California Land Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg and Mr. William B. Ogden in support of the same, and Mr. Peyton Gordon in opposition thereto.

708 James Howard Sumner,
vs. Petitioner,
The Western Maryland

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

argument by Mr. William C. Sullivan in support of the same, and Mr. George R. Walker in opposition thereto. Leave was granted to file the necessary printed copies of the record within ten days, on motion of Mr. William C. Sullivan, for the petitioner.

302. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ella Dutton, as Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss
and for damages or to [illegible]
or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. L. D. Jennings in support of the same, and leave was granted Mr. Frederic D. McKenney to file brief in opposition thereto within three days.

[illegible] Steamship Bowdoin Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

Mr. F. W. Clements, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reverse herein.

[illegible] Kate P. McNaughton, Appellant, vs. W. D. Stephens, Governor, etc. et al.
[illegible] T. E. Neeld et al, Appellants,

Mr. Lucas P. Loring, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these cases.

23 Original. The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, et al.

On motion of Mr. C. B. Ellis in behalf of counsel for the complainant leave is hereby granted to file replication herein.

23 Original. The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, et al.

Mr. C. B. Ellis in behalf of counsel for the complainant submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for an order for the taking of the testimony in this cause.

273. The Postal Telegraph Cable Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Newport, Ky.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, or to transfer the cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Brent Spence in support of the same, and Mr. Morison R. Waite and Mr. John Randolph Schindel in opposition thereto.

679. Henry Miller and Fritz Miller, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George T. Dixon in support of [illegible] Suits

756	The Globe Steamship Co., Claimant, etc., vs. Petitioner, Henry Moss.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Garry in support of the same.
137	The Stevinson Oil & Gas Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, C. E. Dittmann et al.	This cause was submitted pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George S. Ramsey, Mr. Edgar A. de Meules and Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser, Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Jesse H. Wise, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, November 5th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Thomas B. Lantry, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered, that William R. Castle, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.

Jacob C. De Putron, Esquire, of West Falls Church, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

192. Paul Schaumburg, Petitioner, vs. The Dollar Steamship Co., et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr Justice Clarke.

406. Guy B. Biddinger, Appellant, vs. The Commissioner of Police of the City of New York. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United

was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

411 E. F. Kelley, Trustee of the Gibraltar Investment and Home Building Co., Bankrupt, Appellant, vs. Thomas Gill.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

427 W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky, Petitioner, vs. Lucie Apperson.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the

for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

W. J. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky, Petitioner, 428 vs. Elizabeth Creager.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

429	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky, Petitioner, vs. Hugh S. Creager	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

430	W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky, Petitioner, vs. Mildred E. Hooker	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

W. T. Hendrickson, Judge of the County Court of Taylor County, Kentucky,	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
431. vs. Petitioner,	
Sterling Land & Investment Co.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian of The Omaha Tribe of Indians, and of Rosa Wolf Setter, a member of said Tribe,	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,	
Hiram Chase.	

the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

571 Laura Eichel, Madison J. Bray and Philip W. Frey,
Appellants,
vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

33 Charles H. Buchanan,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Warley.

In Error to the Court
of Appeals of the
State of Kentucky

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day

Ex parte In the matter
of Park & Tilford,
24, Original Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus, the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Justice Day

437	Romana Gauzon, Appellant and vs Plaintiff in Error, Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas	Appeal from and In Error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On considera-tion whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs. It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Day

1224	Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co., as Executor and Trustee of the Estate of L. P. Ewald, vs. Plaintiff in Error, City of Louisville.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky

Dissenting: Mr. Justice

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On considera-tion whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby

337	M. H. Smith, vs. Appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission.	Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

339	Addison R. Smith, vs. Appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission.	Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

340 George W. Jones,
vs. Appellant,
Interstate Commerce
Commission

Appeal from the Supreme
Court of the District of
Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Samuel C. Cohen, as
Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Elias W. Samuels,
Bankrupt,
359 vs. Petitioner.
Elias W. Samuels

On writ of certiorari to
the United States Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of

York for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Contributors to the Pennsylvania Hospital, Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

149 vs.

The City of Philadelphia et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lee Wilson & Co., Appellant, — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

150 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

25 The Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas on the relation of S. M. Brewster, Attorney General, and J. T. Botkin, as Secretary of State of the State of Kansas	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

280 R. V. Moore, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. A. Olness, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of North Dakota, et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of

which was argued by counsel. On consideration where of It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

586 The United States of America and Thomas Fisher vs. Wo Jan

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

578 Kate P. McNaughton Appellant, vs. W. D. Stephens, Governor of the State of California, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

579 L. E. Nickell and Robert J. Burke, Appellants, vs. W. D. Stephens Governor of the State of California, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket

per Mr. Chief Justice White

245	Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Ella Dutton, as Administratrix, etc.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White
273	The Postal Telegraph-Cable Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, The City of Newport, Kentucky.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
476	Steamship Bowdoin Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket. per Mr. Chief Justice White.
583	Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co. and E. H. Ratcliff and L. T. Kennedy, its receivers, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Mrs. Clara J. Mullins, Administratrix of the Estate of James Davis Mullins, deceased	It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the writ of error. per Mr. Chief Justice White

635 J. D. Barrett, Petitioner, vs. The Virginian Railway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

576 Corrugated Bar Co., Petitioner, vs. Trussed Concrete Steel Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Bob Terrell, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari

for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

560 Edward W. Blum, Petitioner, vs. The Bumiller Rumler Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

555 J. J. Doane, Petitioner, vs. California Land Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

686
The City of Chicago,
vs. Petitioner,
White Transportation Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

688
Wo Vey
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

695
Theodore Bendinger,
vs. Petitioner,
Michael L. Bowe, Tutor, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari

and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

699 Harry Miller and Fritz Miller, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

706 The Port of Portland, Petitioner, vs. Wilhelm Wilhelmsen, owner of the Steamship "Thode Fagelund", etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said

708 James Howard Sanner, vs Petitioner, The Western Maryland Railway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

710 Sundh Electric Co., vs Petitioner, Cutler-Hammer Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

711 Sundh Electric Co., vs Petitioner, General Electric Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

rari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

726

George Orloff, Louis Fichera, and Isadore Wachtel, Petitioners,
vs.
Abraham Aronson and Harry Aronson, copartners doing business under the firm name and style of Boston Superior Pattern Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible]

The Planters Steamship Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Rolf Seeberg Ship Chandlery Co., Claimant of Steamship "Hispania"

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

728
The Liberal Elevator Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The Wichita Mill & Elevator Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

731
United Metals Selling Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Edward B. Pryor and Edward F. Kearney, as Receivers of The Wabash Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeal sel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

731
N. B. K. Pettingill,
Petitioner,
vs.
Walter McK. Jones

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

732.
Ella Gelkin,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Common Pleas, Dauphin County, State of Pennsylvania

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Common Pleas, Dauphin County, State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

776
The Globe Steamship Co.,
Claimant of the Steamer
"Frances C. Ball,"
Petitioner,
vs.
Henry Moss.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

797
William Bautch,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Strathleven Steamship Co., Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

812
Charles M. Simpson,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consid-printed arguments by Mr. George H. Eichelberger in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

613. Ray Consolidated Copper Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Dan Veazey.

Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

743. The Southern Railway Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Thomas Young.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. Benjamin Lindsay Abney, and Mr. J. E. McDonald in support of the same, and Mr. J. Fraser Lyon in opposition thereto.

268 & 269. Henry A. Oetjen,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Central Leather Co.

Mr. H. Ralph Burton, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

440. H. J. Gunning et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Peter Morrison et al.

Mr. John J. Hamilton, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case to be heard with case No.

742. Hartford Life Insurance Co., Petitioner, vs. Nannie M. Johnson

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. George F. Haid, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr. in support of the same, and Mr. Charles M. Gunnan in opposition thereto.

726. The People of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Eduardo Wys

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Bailey and Mr. Samuel T. Ansell, in support of the same

727. The People of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Aniceto Barrios

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Bailey and Mr. Samuel T. Ansell in support of the same.

Ex parte: In the matter of Annie S. Simmons, Petitioner.
— Original.

Mr. Paul Dulany, in behalf of Mr. Roger Foster, of counsel for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

721 Great Northern Railway Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
The United States of America

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Lindley, Mr. F. V. Brown and Mr. Charles S. Albert in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson in opposition thereto.

226. The T. H. Symington Co.
vs. Petitioner.
The National Malleable Castings Co., et al.

Mr. E. A. Mechlin, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case to be heard with case No. 170.

729 Clemente Ramirez,
vs. Petitioner.
The People of Porto Rico

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Crandall G. Walton in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel T. Ansell and Mr. Edward S. Bailey in opposition thereto.

378 New York Life Insurance Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Lee I. Dodge.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments

Mr. James C. Jones and Mr. James H. McIntosh in opposition thereto.

748 Morgan O. Llewellyn et al., Petitioners, vs. The State of New Mexico. The petition for a writ of certiorari and for a supersedeas herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis C. Wilson and Mr. S. P. Wiseman in support of the same.

741 H. Bradley Davidson and John C. Davidson, Petitioners, vs. The E. F. Brooks Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John C. Gittings in support of the same, and Mr. Henry F. Woodard and Mr. Daniel Thew Wright in opposition thereto.

742 Alberto Sandoval et al., Petitioners, vs. Ida C. Pfeuffer et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Don A. Bliss in support of the same, and Mr. S. J. Brooks in opposition thereto.

750 Eugene M. Moran, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Central Railroad Co. of This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant

on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank M. Hardenbrook, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles E. Miller, of counsel for the defendant in error.

750

Helen Bell, as Administratrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. L. Worthington, Mr. W. D. Cochran and Mr. LeWright Browning in support of the same, and Mr. Allan D. Cole in opposition thereto.

55

José Sanchez y Armijo,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of New Mexico.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

357 Wells Fargo & Co., et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Clarence C. Caldwell,
Attorney General, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

357 Wells Fargo & Co. et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Clarence C. Caldwell,
Attorney General, etc., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be and the same is hereby given the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

417 Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Co., Limited,
vs. Appellant,
James J. Bailey, Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

201
Franz Tempel,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas B. Lantry, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error.

284
The United States,
Petitioner,
vs.
Iver Ingebretsen Ness.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Denis M. Kelleher, of counsel for the respondent.

293
H. C. Jones et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Buffalo Creek Coal & Coke Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Maynard F. Stiles, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. William R. Lilly and Mr. R. C. Alston, of counsel for the defendant in error.

318
Southern Pacific Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Frank R. Stewart.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. William F. Herrin, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas Marioneaux Jr., of counsel for the defendant in error.

Monday, November 5th, 1917, continued.

362.	William A. Ziegler, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin H. Pack, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. A. A. Lee and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees
252 & 253	The Hartford Life Insurance Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Rosa Barber	The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. James C. Jones, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, November 6th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. Burton, it is ordered that George W. Davis and Frank A. Rockwith, Esquires, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell, it is ordered that Jose C. Hernandez and J. Hernandez Usera, Esquires, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

723 J. E. Baldwin, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George P. Kimmel in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

232 & 233 The Hartford Life Insurance Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Rosa Barber.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. James C. Jones, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles E. Morrow, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. James C. Jones, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

454 Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Gilbert.

This cause was argued by Mr. Pierre M. Brown, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Samuel Seabury and Mr. William M. Seabury, of counsel for the defendant in error.

16 B. F. Looney, Attorney General of the State of Texas, Appellant, vs. Crane Co.

This cause was reargued by Mr. C. M. Cureton of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Joseph M. McCormick of counsel for the appellee.

407	The People of the State of New York ex rel. New York and Queens Gas Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs Edward E. McCall et al., Commissioners, etc.	The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. John A. Garver, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, November 7th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis, it is ordered that Clay Hamilton, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, it is ordered that Jacob Chasnoff, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, and Carl S. McPhee, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of Frank M. Slater, Public Administrator, &c.
Original. Petitioner.

Mr. George E. Webster, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

407 The People of the State of New York ex rel. New York & Queens Gas Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward E. McCall et al., Commissioners, &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John A. Garver, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark, of counsel for the defendants in error. Leave was granted to file briefs on the question of jurisdiction alone.

17 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant; continued by Mr. Nicholas W. Hacker, of counsel for Lehigh Valley Coal Sales Co., Mr. F. W. Wheaton, of counsel for the Lehigh Valley Coal Co. and Coxe Brothers & Co., Inc., and Mr. Edgar H. Boles, of counsel for the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant.

18 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of North Carolina.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Murray Allen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James S. Manning and Mr. Robert H. Sykes, of counsel for the defendant in error.

19 William A. Hartranft, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Alexander R. Mullowny, Judge, etc.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for the defendant in error, and Mr. Henry E. Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until

Thursday, November 8th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Franklin Fort, it is ordered that Franklin William Fort, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey and Walter Ewing Hope, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. G. Gardner, it is ordered that Ralph W. Stoddard, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

41 Howard Gould,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Katherine Gould.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Martin W. Littleton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John L. McNab, of counsel for the defendant in error.

19 William A. Hartranft,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Alexander R. Mullowny,
Judge, etc.

The reargument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Henry E. Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

26 Charles A. Korbly,
Receiver, etc.,
Appellant
vs.
Springfield Institution for Savings, et al.

27 Springfield Institution for Savings et al.
Appellants,
vs.
Charles A. Korbly, Receiver, etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. Charles G. Gardner, of counsel for Charles A. Korbly, Receiver, etc., and Mr. Boyd B. Jones, of counsel for the Springfield Institution for Savings et al.

34 United States of America, for the use of W. T. H. Kuester & Co.,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Title Guaranty & Surety Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Claudian B. Northrop, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Lewis

Thursday, November 8th, 1917 continued

35	E. O. Ellison, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, City of La Moure et al.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. S. E. Ellsworth of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.
36	David Lloyd, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, City of La Moure et al.	

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned un-

Friday November 9th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

45 Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. S. Cook, Administrator of W. M. Pobst, deceased.
In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Friday, November 9th, 1917 continued.

47 Chicago Car Heating Co., vs. Appellant, Gold Car Heating & Lighting Co. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Otis Raymond Barrett, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. William A. Redding, Mr. Edward Rector and Mr. Arthur C. Fraser, of counsel for the appellee.

35 E. O. Ellison, vs. Plaintiff in Error, City of La Moure et al.
36 David Lloyd, vs. Plaintiff in Error, City of La Moure et al. — The argument of these causes was concluded by Mr. S. E. Ellsworth, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. No brief was filed for the defendants in error.

38 The Sunday Lake Iron Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Township of Wakefield. — This cause was argued by Mr. Horace Andrews, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James A. O'Neill, of counsel for the defendant in error.

39 The United States, vs. Appellant, California Bridge & Construction Co.
40 California Bridge & Construction Co., vs. Appellant, The United States — The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the California Bridge & Construction Co.

Monday November 12th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Harvey A. Baker, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, Frederic Albert Bauer, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts and Ethelbert Ward, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. H. Downey it is ordered that John L. Hunt, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that Cassius E. Gates and Alfred H. Lundin, Esquires, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Theodore A. Walters, Esquire, of Caldwell, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that George W. Hawkins, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway et al.,
Appellants,
197 vs.
The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and

It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis

34 The United States of America for the use of J. H. Kessler & Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Title Guaranty & Surety Co. | In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

35 E. O. Ellison, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of La Moure and Henry Hodam, as Treasurer of La Moure County, North Dakota. | In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

36. David Lloyd,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of La Moure and
Henry Hedum, as Treasurer
of La Moure County, North
Dakota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

150. Eugene W. Moran,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Central Railroad Co. of
New Jersey.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

258 Helen Bell, as Administratrix of George Bell, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

366 William A. Ziegler and F. W. Keitel, Appellants, vs. The United States, E. M. Dorsey and H. L. Dorsey. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of

of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of Annie S. Simons, Petitioner.
26, Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or other appropriate relief herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte In the matter of Annie S. Simons, Petitioner.
26, Original

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus or other appropriate relief herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by The Honorable Charles M. Hough, Circuit Judge of the United States for the Second Circuit and the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, December 10th, 1917, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

226 The T. H. Symington Co.
vs. Petitioner,
The National Malleable
Castings Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 170, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

268 & 269 Henry A. Oetjen
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Central Leather Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for hearing with case No. 119. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

440 H. J. Gunning et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Peter Morrison et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 147. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

603 Ray Consolidated Copper Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Dan Veazey

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing after case No. 182.
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said

New York Life Insurance Co.,
378 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lee F. Dodge

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hartford Life Insurance Co.,
742 vs. Petitioner,
Nannie M. Johnson

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alberto Sandoval and Felix Sandoval
542 vs. Petitioners,
Ida C. Pfeuffer, H. E. Hildebrand, and Joseph A. Burger

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the

said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

612 Charles M. Simpson, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

721 Great Northern Railway Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

725	J. E. Baldwin, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

726	The People of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Eduardo Wys.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

727	The People of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Aniceto Berrios	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and of the

here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

739 Clemente Ramirez, Petitioner, vs. The People of Porto Rico

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

740 H. Bradley Davidson and John C. Davidson, Petitioners, vs. The E. F. Brooks Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

743	Southern Railway Co., vs. Petitioner Thomas Young	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

745	Morgan O. Llewellyn and Southwestern Surety Insurance Co., vs. Petitioners, The State of New Mexico	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

57	Union Oil Co. of California vs. Plaintiff in Error, S. R. Smith	On motion of Mr. W. S. Penfield, in behalf of counsel. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby

48
San Pedro, Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. Evans Browne, Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. A. S. Halsted, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

39
The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
California Bridge & Construction Co.

40
California Bridge & Construction Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for The United States, and concluded by Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the California Bridge & Construction Co.

50
Norman S. Wear, impleaded with The Wear Land Co., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas ex rel. S. M. Brewster, Attorney General.

This cause was argued by Mr. Francis C. Downey, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. J. L. Hunt, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Monday, November 12th, 1917 continued

42.	American Radiator Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, John F. Rogge, Administrator, etc.	The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, November 13th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney Associate
James C. McReynolds Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis B. James it is ordered that Ewing H. Scott, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Charles J. Fisk, Esquire, of Minot, State of North Dakota, and George F. Short, Esquire, of Idabel, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

37

Cincinnati, Hamilton
& Dayton Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph M. McCollum,
Administrator, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Harry J. Elam and Mr. Morison R. Waite, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Merrill Moores, of counsel for the defendant in error.

42.

American Radiator Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John F. Rogge, Administrator, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John R. English, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

43.

John George Day et al., etc.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

44

The United States of America
ex rel. William F. Arant,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary
of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, of counsel for William F. Arant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, November 14th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

58. Rock Springs Distilling Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. W. A. Gaines & Co.

On motion of Mr. Charles Ray Dean, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

61. Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Alvin J. Fink.

On motion of Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed

44.
The United States of America
ex rel. William F. Arant
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary
of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, of counsel for William F. Arant, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

46.
The Germania Refining Co.,
et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Oramel B. Fuller, Auditor
General, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles D. Chamberlin, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Samuel D. Pepper, and Mr. Alex J. Groesbeck, of counsel for the defendants in error.

49
Francis Stephen Medcraf,
vs. Appellant,
Robert T. Hodge, as Sheriff &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Cassius E. Gates, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until

Thursday, November 15th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grant Jarvis it is ordered that John E. Gunn, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice, as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Prentiss, it is ordered that Elma D. Pratt, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

T. Curry, Esquire, of Bradentown, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day it is ordered that Henry W. Brush, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Horace G. McKeever, Esquire, of Enid, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

H. C. King,
63. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Putnam Investment Co.

On motion of Mr. Enoch A. Chase in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

The United States of America
ex relatione Daniel Bowling,
a minor, suing by his Guardian
and Next Friend J. P. Dunn,
64 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Thomas D. Aitken, Vicente
Cobas, F. C. Fisher et al.,
65. vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The United States of America,
by its Trustee, the Government
of the Philippine Islands

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the Philippine Islands.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Francis Stephen Medcraf,
49 vs. Appellant,
Robert T. Hodge, as Sheriff, &c.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr Cassius E. Gates, of counsel for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

51.

The Duncan Townsite Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Merillat, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the defendant in error.

52.

Cornelia Sweet et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Elmer E. Schock, as Treasurer, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Francis W. Clements, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. S. P. Freeling, of counsel for the defendants in error.

53

Ed. Crane, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. J. Campbell, Sheriff, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. A. Walters, of counsel for the defendant in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. J. H. Tierney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

56

Municipal Securities Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Kansas City.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. C. Scarritt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday November 16th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Lamar it is ordered that Rufus B. Daniel, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Geller, it is ordered that Walter S. Hilborn, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Enterprise Railway
Equipment Co.,
69 vs. Appellant,
Norfolk & Western
Railway Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. N. Low and Mr. George I. Haight of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Theodore W. Reath and Mr. Robert J. Fisher, of counsel for the appellee.

The United States ex rel.
Louisville Cement Co.
70 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On motion of Mr. Charles W. Needham, of counsel for the defendant in error, It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 4 rule 26.

Municipal Securities
Corporation,
56. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Kansas City

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. C. Scarritt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. A. F. Smith, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. W. C. Scarritt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

58 Bellows Falls Power Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This cause was argued by Mr. Richard Y. FitzGerald, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, of counsel for the defendant in error.

62. Caroline Boldt, Administratrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Bunn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, November 19th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Archibald A. Gulick, Esquire, of New York City, and Freeman C. Davidson, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Connell, it is ordered that Robert A. Kutschbock, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. R. Ross Perry, Jr., it is ordered that Charles R. Cummings, Esquire, of Fall River, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel J. Greene, it is ordered that Howard F. Morgan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Francis Williams, it is ordered that Henry Culbertson Clark, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury, it is ordered that Henry Oswald Head, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

Howard Gould,
41. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Katherine Gould

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of

4953

New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs.

per Mr Justice McReynolds.

252
The Hartford Life Insurance Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Rosa Barber.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Holmes.

253
The Hartford Life Insurance Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Rosa Barber.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of

tion whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

37. Bellows Falls Power Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of
Massachusetts.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

49. Francis Stephen Medcalf,
vs. Appellant,
Robert T. Hodge, as Sheriff
of King County, Washington.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United

argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

42

American Radiator Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John F. Rogge, Administrator of the Estate of John F. Rogge, Jr., deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

49

Enterprise Railway Equipment Co.
vs. Appellant,
Norfolk & Western Railway Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs.

per Mr Justice McKenna

7 Chicago Car Heating Co., Appellant,
vs.
Gold Car Heating & Lighting Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs.

per Mr Justice McKenna

26. The Germania Refining Co. and The Independent Refining Co. Limited, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Daniel B. Fuller, Auditor General, and The State Board of Assessors of the State of Michigan.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of

tion whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudge
this Court that the judgment of the said Supre
Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, af
with costs.

per Mr Justice McKenna

Ex parte. In the matter of
Frank M. Slater, Public
Administrator of the City
of St. Louis, Missouri, as
such in charge of the Estate
of David T. Bomar, deceased,
27. Original Petitioner.

On consideration
motion for leave t
a petition for a w
mandamus herein,
now here ordered b
Court that the sa
motion be, and th
is hereby granted.

per Mr Justice McKenna

Ex parte. In the matter of
Frank M. Slater, Public
Administrator of the City
of St. Louis, Missouri as
such in charge of the Estate
of David T. Bomar, deceased,
27. Original Petitioner.

On consideration
petition for a wr
mandamus herein
is now here ordere
the Court that ca
shown by The Ho
David P. Dyer,
of the District C
the United States for the Eastern District of Miss
before this Court, at the City of Washington, on M
December 10th, 1917 or as soon thereafter as counsel
be heard, why the prayer of said petition should
granted.

per Mr Justice McKenna

712 New York Scaffolding Co., Petitioner, vs. Liebel-Binney Construction Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

713 New York Scaffolding Co., Petitioner, vs. Chain Belt Co. and Egbert Whitney

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

558 New York Scaffolding Co., Petitioner, vs Egbert Whitney

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of cases Nos. 712 and 713.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos 504, 391, 525, 678, 679, 202, 273, 476 and 378, be assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

Mr. Justice McKenna announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 26th instant, to Monday, December 10th next.

75 The United States, Appellant, vs. St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway Co. et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, to be heard with case No. 130.

Monday, November 19th 1917, continued.

521 Southern Oregon Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition in the District Court for an order permitting the sale of timber on the land in controversy.

534 The People of Porto
Rico et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Carlos Tapia.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reassign this cause for hearing on the first Monday in January next.

695 The People of Porto
Rico et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error
vs. and Petitioners,
Jose Muratti.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and petitioners submitted, to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause and assign it for hearing at the same time as case No. 534.

784 Minneapolis & St. Louis
Railroad Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of
America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Miner in sup-

73	Stephen W. Allen, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. J. F. Trimmer, as Treasurer, etc.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed per stipulation of counsel.
755	Hargadine McKittrick Dry Goods Co., Petitioner, vs. Christian J. Zeitinger et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles A. Houts and [illegible] in support of the same, and Mr. Matt G. Reynolds, in opposition thereto.
685	Eneas J. McCurdy, County Treasurer, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America	Mr. Preston C. Shinn, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
455	Adelbert A. Wieland, as State Engineer, etc. et al., Appellants, vs. The Pioneer Irrigation Co.	The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edwin N. Post in support of the same, and Mr. Fred. Farrar and Mr. Leslie E. Hubbard in opposition thereto.

Monday, November 19th 1917 continued.

62. Caroline Boldt, Administratrix, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Rufus S. Day, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

66 J. Henry Hull, as Trustee, &c.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Farmers Loan & Trust Co., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter S. Heilborn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, Mr. Frederick Geller, of counsel for the defendant in error, The Farmers Loan & Trust Co., and Mr. Henry B. Twombley, of counsel for the defendant in error, Francis J. Palmer.

67 Abercrombie & Fitch Co. et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Frederic E. Baldwin et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James R. Offield, of counsel for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, November 20th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that C. S. Schneider, Esquire, of Paxton, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury it is ordered that G. C. Fulton, Esquire, of Astoria, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

79. John Johnstone,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Andrew Schmidt, Northwestern Improvement Co., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

82. The Missouri Pacific Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued per stipulation of counsel.

67. Abercrombie & Fitch Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Frederick E. Baldwin et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James Q. Rice, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. James R. Offield, of counsel for the petitioners.

Tuesday, November 20th, 1917, continued.

68 The United States of America, Appellant,
vs.
Reading Company et al.

80 Reading Company et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America.

The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for The United States of America, and continued by Mr. Jackson E. Reynolds, of counsel for the Reading Co. et al., and Mr. Robert W. De Forest, of counsel for the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Wednesday, November 21st, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Walter Nelles, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. C. Fulton, it is ordered that Bert W. Henry, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

H. Case, Esquire, of Denver, and Robert E. L. Smith, Esquire, of Rockville, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Frank T. Miller, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

68 The United States of America, Appellant,
vs.
Reading Company et al.

80 Reading Company et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America.

The reargument of these cases was continued by Mr. Robert W. De Forest, of counsel for the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States of America.

71 Lucinda Burton, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.

72 Cora B. Herren, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.

These causes were argued by Mr. William F. Connell, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Robert A. Kutschbock, of counsel for the defendant in error.

90 Wilhelmina Elizabeth Peterson et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Iowa ex rel. The State Treasurer et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hugh O'Neill, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Truman C. Davidson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

76 The Houston Oil Co. of Texas et al., Petitioners, vs. Cornelia G. Goodrich et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William L. Marbury of counsel for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, November 22d, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter } Associate Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Lawson L. Hardy, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis B. James, it is ordered that George R. Nutter, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Stonebraker Zinc Oxide Co.,
84 vs. Appellant,
The United States

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

George W. Egan,
85 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Charles S. McDonald

The motion to continue this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Ralph H. Case, of counsel for the plaintiff in error in support of the same, and Mr. Charles O. Bailey and Mr. John H. Voorhees, of counsel for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

James McDowall et al.,
86 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Edward J. Donovan et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

87 George H. Munroe et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edward J. Bowman et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

76 The Houston Oil Co. of Texas et al., Petitioners, vs. Cornelia G. Goodrich et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William L. Marbury, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. William D. Gordon, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. H. O. Head, of counsel for the petitioners

77 Henry M. Jones et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Portland

This cause was argued by Mr. Eben Winthrop Freeman, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Carroll S. Chaplin, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Thursday, November 22d, 1917 continued.

78	H. S. McGowan et al., Appellants, vs. Columbia River Packers' Association et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Bert W. Henry, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, November 23rd, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Nutter, it is ordered, that Jacob J. Kaplan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Bryan, it is ordered, that Ernest E. Zeiger, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by

Gibboney, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. T. Bledsoe, it is ordered that A. L. Doud, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

91 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States of America et al.,

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry L. Stone and Mr. William A. Colston, of counsel for the appellant, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for The United States of America, and Mr. Joseph W. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission. Leave was granted counsel for the appellant to file a reply brief within one week.

78 H. F. McGowan et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Columbia River Packers' Association et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Bert W. Henry, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. C. E. Fulton, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Bert W. Henry, of counsel for the appellants.

81 Frank L. Kirk et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Hans Olson

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick, of counsel for the defendant in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. William G. Porter, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

83 Menasha Wooden Ware Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred H. Bright of counsel for the defendant in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. A. E. Thompson and Mr. J. C. Thompson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

85 A. M. Dunn, Administrator, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. C. Brown, Treasurer, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Nelson Miller, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Herman C. Davidson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

507 Elina Skarderud,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Tax Commission of the State of North Dakota

It is ordered by the Court that the order entered herein on October 22d, 1917, advancing this cause and assigning the same for argument on Monday, January 7th, 1918, be, and the same is hereby vacated and set aside.

Friday, November 23d, 1917, continued.

507. Elmer Skandrud, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Tax Commission of the State of North Dakota.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Edward Engerud, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and leave was granted counsel for the defendant in error to file brief within one week.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, November 26th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, it is ordered that Wallace S. Burnett, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert L. Owen, it is ordered that Benjamin F. Rice and Thomas D. Lyons, Esquires, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

454

Philadelphia & Reading
Coal & Iron Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John Gilbert

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

30

Norman S. Wear, impleaded *sub nom.*, The Wear Sand Co., and F. D. Fowler,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas *ex rel.* S. M. Brewster, Attorney General.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

43.	John George Day and Isaiah Newton Day, partners under the firm name of J. G. & I. N. Day, Appellants, vs. The United States.	Appeal from the Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here Ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

57	Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph McCollum, Administrator of the Estate of Joseph William Roebuck.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, November 26th, 1917, continued

Hartford Beaumont,
Assignee of W. Borck,
Appellant and
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Manuel Prieto, et al., Administrators, etc.

On consideration of the motion to docket and dismiss this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Oregon Co.,
531 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellant herein for leave to present to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon a petition praying for an order authorizing and directing the sale of certain timber standing on the lands involved in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that said District Court is hereby authorized to make such order thereon as may be proper.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of Porto Rico,
Epifanio Rivera and
Alonso Padial,
534 vs. Appellants,
Carlos Tapia.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause for argument on Monday, January 7th next, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the

Monday, November 26th, 1917, continued.

647

The People of Porto Rico
and Charles E. Foote,
Judge of the District
Court of Mayaguez,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Jose Muratti

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause for hearing with case No. 534, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

685

Eneas J. McCurdy,
County Treasurer, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

435

Adelbert A. Wieland, as
State Engineer, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The Pioneer Irrigation Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, November 26th 1917 continued

88 George W. Egan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles S. McDonald.

It is ordered by the Court that the consideration of the motion to continue this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to Thursday, December 6th next, in order to afford time to the plaintiff in error to make the necessary deposit to cover the cost of printing the record. It is further ordered that the consideration of the suggestion of the defendant in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to Thursday, December 6th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Hargadine-McKittrick Dry Goods Co., Petitioner,
755 vs.
Christian J. Zeitinger et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union Pacific Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
623 vs.
L. A. Laughlin.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to transfer the cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff in support of the same, and Mr. F. N. Watson and Mr. N. H. Loomis in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Southwestern Surety Insurance Co., Petitioner.
...... Original

Mr. Hayden Johnson, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause.

Monday, November 26th, 1917, continued.

753
John A. Jesson et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
F. G. Noyes, as Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. H. Metson in support of the same, and Mr. Orion L. Rider in opposition thereto.

762
James B. Simpson, indicted as James B. Miller,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. Thomas E. Hayden in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts in opposition thereto.

163
John E. Roller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles Catlett, Trustee.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Rudolph Bumgardner in support of the same, and Mr. John E. Roller pro se in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, December 10th next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 10th. 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John S. G. Gallagher, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Eli J. Blair and Don Carlos Buell, Esquires of New York City, and Harry L. Patton, Esquire, of Clovis, State of New Mexico be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Gregg, it is ordered that George F. Howard, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas be

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick Kelley, it is ordered that Dora Boneta Whitney, of Benton Harbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Raker, it is ordered that Claude F. Purkitt, Esquire, of Willows, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander S. Lanier, it is ordered that Edward Mascolo, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. L. Hamilton, it is ordered that Harris J. Whitney, Esquire, of Benton Harbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, it is ordered that William C. Rempfer, Esquire, of Parkston, State of torney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, it is ordered that John C. Wait, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Carter, it is ordered that Edwin T. Taliaferro, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Hering, it is ordered that John B. Shorett, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles A. Korbly, Receiver of
The Pynchon National Bank,
26 vs. Appellant,
Springfield Institution for Savings, Springfield Five Cents
Savings Bank, and Hampden
Savings Bank.
Springfield Institution for Savings, Springfield Five Cents
Savings Bank, and Hampden
Savings Bank,
27 vs. Appellants,
Charles A. Korbly, Receiver of
The Pynchon National Bank.

Appeals from the
United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, each party to pay their own costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter

39	The United States, vs. Appellant, California Bridge & Construction Co.	Appeals from the Court of Claims.
40	California Bridge & Construction Co., vs. Appellant, The United States.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

467	The People of the State of New York ex rel. New York and Queens Gas Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Edward E. McCall et al. Commissioners, constituting The Public Service Commission of The State of New York for the First District.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of

ation whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

51
The Duncan Townsite Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

66
J. Harry Hall, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Estate of Francis J. Palmer, Bankrupt,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Farmers Loan & Trust Co. and Francis J. Palmer.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of

eration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

71 Lucinda Burton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

72. Cora B. Heeren, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New York Central Hudson River Railroad Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme firmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States,
284 vs Petitioner.
Jens Ingebretsen Ness

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Iowa for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

B. C. Jones, H. C. Jones, Executor, James Dollison Brown et al.,
293 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Buffalo Creek Coal & Coke Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia of. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Justice Brandeis

Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of North Carolina — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

18

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Van Devanter.

Ed. Crane, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. J. Campbell, Sheriff of Latah County, Idaho. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

53

per Mr Justice McReynolds

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme

Hitchman Coal & Coke Company, Petitioner,
vs.
John Mitchell, individual, etc., T. L. Lewis, individually, W. B. Wilson, individually, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia be, and the same is hereby modified by striking out the award of injunction against John Mitchell, W. B. Wilson, and Thomas Hughes, who, while named as defendants in the bill, were not served with process and entered no appearance except to object to the jurisdiction of the Court over them, and that said decree be further modified by striking out the award of injunction against John P. White, Frank J. Hayes, Edwin Perry, John Moore, John Alexander, William Roy, and William Applegarth, who, pending suit, were chosen to succeed some of the original defendants as officers of certain unions, but who were not served with process and did not appear, and that said decree be further modified by eliminating picketing and physical violence from the sweep of the injunction, but without prejudice to plaintiff's right to obtain an injunction hereafter against these forms of interference if proof shall be produced, either in proceedings supplemental to this action or in an independent action, that such an injunction is needed; and that the said decree of the District Court, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Clarke

firmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

11	Hitchman Coal & Coke Co. vs. Petitioner, John Mitchell, individually; T. L. Lewis, individually; W. B. Wilson, individually et al.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, with costs; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia be, and the same is hereby, modified by eliminating picketing and physical violence from the sweep of the injunction, but without prejudice to plaintiff's right to obtain an injunction hereafter against these forms of interference if proof shall be produced, either in proceedings supplemental to this action or in an independent action, that such an injunction is needed, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion

Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co.,
Petitioner.
23. vs.
Thomas W. Rowe, individually and as President of American Flint Glass Workers' Union, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted, the record heretofore filed on the appeal to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co.,
Appellant,
23 vs.
Thomas W. Rowe, individually and as President of American Flint Glass Workers' Union, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, so far as it directed that the temporary injunction be dissolved, but so far as it directed a dismissal of the bill be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court

West Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Holmes
Mr Justice Clarke.

Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co., Appellant, vs. Thomas W. Rowe, individually and as President of American Flint Glass Workers' Union, et al.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

23

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Justice Pitney.

Schneider Granite Co., 461 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Gast Realty & Investment Co. and Emily Gast. Gast Realty & Investment Co. and Emily Gast, 478 vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Schneider Granite Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, on writ of error and cross writ of error, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, each party to pay its own costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Crew Levick Co., 497 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

81
Frank L. Kirk, Elisha S. Kirk and Elma E. Kirk,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Hans Olson

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

181
The Merrimac Oil & Gas Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
C. E. Dittman, L. H. Dittman, J. A. Dittman, and C. E. Dittman Oil & Gas Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof

Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Justice Day.

Henry M. Jones, Herbert Payson, Howard Winslow et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
77 vs.
The City of Portland.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Day.

Cornelia Sweet, J. A. Price, Mabel N. Price et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
52. vs.
Elmer E. Schock as Treasurer of Okmulgee County, State of Oklahoma, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consid-by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Abercrombie & Fitch Co. and Justrite Manufacturing Co., Petitioners,
vs.
Frederic E. Baldwin and John Simmons Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

67

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America ex rel. William F. Arant
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

[illegible]

Th

from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Wilhelmina Elizabeth Peterson et al., Legatees of Margrethe Anderson, deceased,
Plaintiffs in Error,
79 vs.
The State of Iowa ex rel.
The State Treasurer et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Chief Justice White

A. M. Dunn, Administrator of the Estate of John Peterson, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
85 vs.
W. C. Brown, Treasurer of the State of Iowa.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

16	Ben F. Looney, Attorney General of the State of Texas, Appellant, vs. Crane Company.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

165	John E. Roller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles Catlett, Trustee.	In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

507 Elina Skandrud, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Tax Commission of the State of North Dakota. | In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

83 Menasha Wooden Ware Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. | In Error to the Circuit Court of Winnebago County, State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Winnebago County, State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Wisconsin.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of Southwestern Surety Insurance Co.
Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of Southwestern Surety Insurance Co.
Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable James E. Boyd, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, January 7th, 1918, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

623. Union Pacific Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
L. A. Laughlin

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

755. John A. Jesson, E. R. Peoples, James W. Hill et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
F. G. Noyes as Receiver of the Washington Alaska Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

762. James B. Simpson indicted as James B. Miller,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

88 George W. Egan,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles S. McDonald.

The provisions of Rule 10 having been now complied with by the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that the motion to dismiss for failure to print the record be, and the same is hereby, denied. It is further ordered that the motion to continue the case to the next term be denied, and the case is assigned for hearing on Monday, January 28th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

181 Oliver B. Sandfield,
Administrator, etc.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed subject to the provisions of section 4, rule 26.

[illegible] The Grand Trunk
Western Railway Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that the to the provisions of section 3 rule 26.

325	The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas Goldman et al.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these cases.
327	J. A. Hays, Collector, &c., Petitioner, vs. The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.	
334	The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., vs. Joseph J. Scott, as Collector, &c.,	
371	The Toledo Newspaper Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.	
421	E. J. Lynch, Collector, &c., Petitioner, vs. Henry Turrish.	
422	E. J. Lynch, Collector &c. Petitioner, vs. N. C. Hornby.	
468	The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph L. Schinder, trading, &c.	
492	Emanuel J. Doyle, Coll'r, &c., Petitioner, vs. Mitchell Brothers Co.	
591	The United States of America Petitioner, vs. The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chica-	

390 The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Biwabik Mining Co.

452 Southern Pacific Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Z. Lowe Jr., Collector ([illegible])

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Gordon M. Buck in opposition thereto.

753 Charles A. Peabody, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mark Eisner, Collector &c.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and Mr. Henry W. Clark in opposition thereto.

754 H. H. Riddell, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Y. Masters in support of the same, and leave was granted the Solicitor General to file brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

601 Midland Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Minnie Griffith, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm and for damages was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. L. Cunningham and Mr. C. J. Atkinson in support of the same, and Mr. L. T. Michener in opposition thereto.

609 John B. Turner, Petitioner, vs. Board of Trade of the City of Chicago.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph E. Johnson in support of the same, and Mr. Henry S. Robbins in opposition thereto.

611 John D. Ireland, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner, etc.

Mr. Don Carlos Buell in behalf of Mr. Robert S. Johnstone, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to dismiss this cause.

656 etc. Charles E. Ruthenberg et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The United States.

On motion of Mr. Walter Nelles in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief

[illegible]

777 Central California Canneries Co. et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Dunkley Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William R. White in support of the same; and Mr. Fred L. Chappell in opposition thereto.

" Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner,
vs.
John Mitchell, individually, et al.

The motion of the petitioner for a rule against certain respondents for contempt was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hannis Taylor and Mr. R. E. L. Gilchrist in support of the same and leave was granted Mr. Charles E. Hogg, of counsel for the respondents, to file brief in opposition thereto within sixty days.

656 etc. Charles E. Ruthenberg et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America
(and another case.)

On motion of Mr. Hannis Taylor in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in these cases as amicus curiae.

455 Southern Pacific Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
John T. Lowe, Jr., Coll. [illegible] Etc.

Mr. A. A. Hoehling Jr. in behalf of Mr. Gordon M. Buck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

563 Henry R. Towne,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mark Eisner, Collector, &c.

On motion of Mr. A. A. Hoehling Jr. in behalf of Mr. Gordon M. Buck, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

769 Meyer Grauhand,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The United States of America

On motion of Mr. Edwin T. [illegible], of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby advanced to be heard with case No 455 and other like cases.

757 A. W. Lehmann,
vs. Petitioner,
Stock Yards Loan Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. N. P. White in support of the same and Mr. B. F. Burchmore and Mr. Robert F. [illegible] in opposition thereto.

597 Sidney J. Brooks, Receiver, etc.,
Appellant,
vs.
Empire Trust Co. et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas H. Franklin and Mr. Stephen H. Allen in support of the same, and Mr. Chester H. Terrell and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in opposition thereto.

678 The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Mississippi and Lincoln County, Mississippi.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

26 Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Elmer S. Simmons,
Petitioner.

This cause was argued by Mr. Roger Foster, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Edgar T. Brackett, of counsel for the respondent.

234 William E. Peck & Co. Inc.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector, &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles O. Spencer, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Tuesday, December 11th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Norman H. Dodge, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

354 William E. Peck & Co., Inc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector, &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

7, Original. The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. E. Thompson, of counsel for the complainant, continued by Mr. C. Edmund Wright, of counsel for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. [illegible], of counsel for the complainant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, December 12th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Jeziel W. Joseph, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and Allen W. Kent, Esquire, of Mount Clemens, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Kenyon, it is ordered that Frank E. Gill and Jacob F. Kass, Esquires, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Bleeman, it is ordered that Louis [illegible], Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Edward Thomas it is ordered that Alexander Sidney Rosenthal, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupré it is ordered that C. V. Porter, Jr., Esquire, of Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. B. Craighill, it is ordered that G. A. Sutherland, Esquire of Hominy, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis B. James, it is ordered that Edward John McVann, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

563 Henry R. Towne,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mark Eisner, Collector, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error.

565 Theodore S. Rosen et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States
595 Victor Parisi,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States

These cases were argued by Mr. Terence J. McManus, of counsel, for the petitioners, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, December 13th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis B. James it is ordered that Alexander Whiteside, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Henry L. Scarlett, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A.

Robert Evans and Hiram K. Evans, Esquires, of Corydon, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Allen L. Chickering, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, it is ordered that Ira B. McNeal, Esquire, of Sharon, State of Pennsylvania, James W. Diffenbaugh, Esquire, of Lancaster, Charles M. Eckert, Esquire, of Cleveland, and James A. White, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio; and Frank B. Ebbert, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that D. W. Odell, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States
523 vs.
Antonio Moreno.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel appearance was entered for Antonio Moreno.

626 Fort Smith & Western Railroad Co. et al., Appellants, vs. Arthur L. Mills, Receiver, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. C. Dustin of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for The United States.

656 Charles E. Ruthenberg et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Sharts, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to withdraw the appearance of Mr. Clarence S. Darrow, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

656 Charles E. Ruthenberg et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.
663 Joseph F. Amer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.
664 Alfred F. Goald, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.
665 Otto Wangerin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Joseph W. Sharts of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in cause No. 656, and continued by Mr. T. E. Latimer, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in causes Nos. 663, 664, 665 and 666; Mr. Harry Weinberger, of

Walter Wangerin,
666 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States
Louis Kramer and
Morris Graber,
680 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States
Louis Kramer,
681 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.
Emma Goldman et al.
702 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.
Albert Jones,
738 vs. Appellant
C. W. Perkins, Deputy U.S.
Marshal, et al.
Meyer Graubard,
769 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States

tiffs in error in cases
Nos. 680, 681 and 702;
Mr. J. Gordon Jones, of
counsel for the appel-
lant in case No 738,
and Mr. Edwin T.
Taliaferro, of counsel
for the plaintiff in
error in case No 769

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, December 14th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that De Pratt White, Esquire, of New York City, and E. A. Blythe, Esquire, of Hugo, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene it is ordered that John W. Garfield, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by

Tillmann, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis S. Gottlieb it is ordered that Leon Sanders, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted, to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Guy, it is ordered that Alfred Clum, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles E. Ruthenberg et al.
656 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States,
Joseph F. Arver,
663 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.
Alfred F. Grahl.
664 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States
Otto Wangerin.
665 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States
Walter Wangerin.
666 vs. Plaintiff in Error

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Edwin T. Taliaferro, of counsel for the plaintiff in error in case No. 769; Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error and appellees and Mr. Joseph W. Sharts, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in

680	Louis Kramer and Morris Becker, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The United States.	submitted by Mr. Harry Weinberger, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in cases Nos. 680, 681 and 702.
681	Louis Kramer, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The United States	
702	Emma Goldman et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The United States.	
738	Albert Jones, vs. Appellant, H. W. Perkins, Deputy U. S. Marshal, et al.	
769	Meyer Greenband, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The United States	

89 A. C. Stellwagen, Trustee, etc., vs. Alfred Clum, Trustee, etc. — This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred Clum, for Alfred Clum, Trustee etc., and submitted on a printed certificate and brief by Mr. Bernard B. [illegible], of counsel for A. C. Stellwagen, Trustee etc.

90 The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., vs. Appellant, The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Douglas — This cause was argued by Mr. [illegible], of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. [illegible], of counsel for

Monday, December 17th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
James C. McReynolds Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Orie S. Ware, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, and William A. Seifert, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Sterling, it is ordered that Stephen G. Porter, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. W. W. Millan it is ordered that Henry N. Bogert and Henry V. Borst, Esquires, of Amsterdam, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Shadrach L. Hodgin, Esquire, of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Edson, it is ordered that Samuel Caplan, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, it is ordered that Ross B. Smith, Esquire, of Chanute, State of Kansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Alfred G. Hagerty, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Mr. Clyde B. Aitchison, it is ordered that Charles E. Ahlquist, Esquire, of Rush City, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert L. Hunt, it is ordered that Jacob A. Metzger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. C. Walters, it is ordered that William Healy, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Szold, it is ordered that Benjamin Rabalsky, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Kaplan, it is ordered that Louis E. Feingold, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

348 Southern Pacific Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank R. Bryant — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

78 N. S. McGowan, Ervist Lindstrom, and J. P. Coyle, Appellants, vs. Columbia River Packers Association and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified so as to direct the dismissal of the bill without prejudice, and as so modified be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that the [illegible]

611 Midland Valley Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs Maude Griffith, Administratrix of the Estate of Elmer C. Griffith, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction with five per cent. damages.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

697 Sidney J. Brooks Receiver of The San Antonio Land & Irrigation Co. Limited, Appellant, vs. Empire Trust Co., Floyd McGown, Receiver of The San Antonio Land & Irrigation Co., Limited, and San Antonio Land & Irrigation Co. Limited	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel on motion to dismiss or affirm. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

325
The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas Goldman et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday March 4th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

327
S. A. Hays, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
vs. Petitioner,
The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.

334
The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co.
vs. Petitioner,
Joseph J. Scott, as Collector of U. S. Internal Revenue, etc.

421
E. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
vs. Petitioner,
Henry Turrish.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument at the same time on Monday March 4th next after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

per

Monday, December 17th, 1917, continued.

W. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
391. vs. Petitioner
H. C. Hornby

Emmanuel J. Doyle, Collector of Internal Revenue,
392. vs. Petitioner,
Mitchell Brothers Co.

The United States of America,
393. vs. Petitioner
The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.

The United States of America,
394. vs. Petitioner
Biwabik Mining Co.

The Toledo Newspaper Co. et al.,
711. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
658. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph L. Schider, trading as Joseph L. Schider & Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the

tion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for Monday, March 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

611 John D. Ireland, vs. Plaintiff in Error. Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner of the City of New York. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for Monday, March 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Southern Pacific Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. John Z. Lowe, Jr., U. S. Collector of Internal Revenue, &c. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for Monday, March 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

661 John B. Turner, vs. Petitioner. Board of Trade of the City of Chicago. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the

herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

754 H. H. Riddell, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

757 A. W. Lohman, Petitioner, vs. Stock Yards Loan Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

777

Central California Canneries Co., et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Dunkley Company

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Friday the 21st instant until Wednesday, January 2, 1918.

44

The United States of America ex rel. William F. Arant
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion of Mr. H. Prescott Gatley of counsel for William F. Arant, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandate in this cause.

793 Southern Pacific Co., Petitioner, vs. Henry L. Bryant et al., Executors, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Louis H. Friedman and Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt in support of the same, and Mr. H. Snowden Marshall, [illegible] in opposition thereto.

7 Original. The People of the State of New York, Complainants, vs. State of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, April 15, 1918.

771 Ng Ching Foong, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward M. Cleary and Mr. Philip S. Ehrlich in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

657 Peter Chelentis, Petitioner, vs. Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.

Mr. Fayette B. Dow, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the cause this morning.

781 Gulf Oil Corporation, Petitioner, vs. C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert and Mr. James H. Beal in support of the same.

558 Henry W. Bowman, Petitioner, vs. William Hale Thompson, Mayor, etc., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. James R. Ward in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Chester E. Cleveland in opposition thereto.

782 Edward W. Morrison, Petitioner, vs. Charles S. Deneen. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. James R. Ward in support of the same.

19. Original. State of Minnesota, Complainant, vs. State of Wisconsin. On motion of Mr. C. C. Ellingquist in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to file the evidence in this cause, and to open and publish the same

George M. Glenn, In Error to the Supreme
131 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Court of the State of
Southern Express Co. North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George M. Glenn, In Error to the Supreme
132 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Court of the State of
Southern Express Co. North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David J. Waller, Jr., et al., This cause was argued
Trustees, etc. by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins
92 vs. Appellants, of counsel for the ap-
Texas & Pacific Railway Co. pellants, and by Mr.
Thomas J. Freeman,

Monday, December 17th, 1917 continued.

93 William Filene's Sons Co., Petitioner, vs. Charles F. Weed et al., Receivers &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George R. Nutter, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, December 18th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, it is ordered that Henry L. Adams, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright, it is ordered that Dean Burkheimer, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Tuesday, December 18th, 1917, continued

Willard J. Banyon, Esquire, of Benton Harbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. G. Porter, it is ordered that Andrew G. Smith and William N. Dodds, Esquires, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

93	William Filene's Sons Co., Petitioner, vs. Charles F. Weed et al., Receivers, etc.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George R. Nutter, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Frederick H. Nash, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. George R. Nutter, of counsel for the petitioner.
95.	Robert H. Gardiner, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. William S. Butler & Co., Inc., et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Alexander Whiteside, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. Frederick H. Nash, of counsel for the respondents.
94.	The United States, Appellant, vs. J. S. Stearns Lumber Co.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of

and Mr. Arthur Dyrenforth, of counsel for the appellee.

96	Edward F. Johnson, Plaintiff in Error, v. J. D. Lankford et al.	These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Charles West, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.
97	Lawrence Marston, Plaintiff in Error, v. J. D. Lankford et al.	

98	Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Appellants, v. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Robbins, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Wednesday, December 19th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Leo A. Rogers, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Hogsett, it is ordered that John E. Morley, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, it is ordered that Ira K.

to practice, as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

Benjamin Winthrop, Frederic Winthrop, Charles F. Cox, individually and as Executor of the Estate of Mark T. Cox, et al., etc.,

381 vs. Appellants,

Grant Fellows, as Attorney General of the State of Michigan, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, et al.,

98 vs. Appellants,

The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry S. Robbins, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Henry S. Robbins of counsel for the appellants.

99
The United States,
vs. Appellant,
Frederick H. Sweet,
Administrator, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. A. C. Ellis Jr. of counsel for the appellee.

188
W. E. Martin, Jr.,
Trustee, etc.
vs. Petitioner,
Commercial National
Bank of Macon, Ga.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. Douglas Feagin of counsel for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Orville A. Park, of counsel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Thursday, December 20th 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
James C. McReynolds Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank P. Prichard, it is ordered that J. Rodgers McCreery and Nicholas R. Criss, Esquires, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. D. Norton, it is ordered that M. C. Lavell, Esquire, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court, in this behalf

Johnson, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

111 Emma T. Krueger, vs. Appellant, The United States. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. William V. Hodges, of counsel for the appellant; and, on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellee, leave was granted to file a brief in that behalf within ten days.

150 W. E. Martin, Jr., Trustee, etc., vs. Petitioner, Commercial National Bank of Macon, Georgia. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Orville A. Park, of counsel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Rudolph S. Wimberly, of counsel for the petitioner.

102. Secundino Omaechevarria, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Idaho. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank P. Reid and, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. T. A. Walters and Mr. William Healy, of counsel for the defendant; and concluded by Mr. W. V. Hodges, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Thursday, December 20th 1917 continued

102	Union Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Minnie Kuhn Grosman et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William H. Atwell, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Friday, December 2nd 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present,
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
James C. McReynolds Justices
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. E. Roberts, it is ordered that John S. Orr, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Swingle it is ordered that Francis Henry Miner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

128 John H. Sears, Trustee, vs. Appellant, The City of Akron. On motion of Mr. George W. Wickersham, for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

778 William F. Brooks, vs. Appellant, The United States. Mr. Frederick A. Tyler, in behalf of the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

116 Union Trust Co., vs. Petitioner, Minnie Nathan Grosman et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William H. Atwell, of counsel for the petitioner and Mr. J. M. McCormick, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. William H. Atwell, of counsel for the petitioner.

104 Union Pacific Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Ella Huxoll, Administratrix, etc. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. N. H. Loomis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Halleck F. Rose, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. C. R. Mayhew, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Wednesday, January 2d 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Austin Thompson, it is ordered that Edward Elliott, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. F. Kirby, it is ordered that Foster A. Butt, Esquire, of Eureka Springs, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, January 2, 1918, continued

International Harvester
Co. of New Jersey et al.,
114 vs. Appellants,
The United States.

Eastman Kodak Co. et al.,
166 vs. Appellants,
The United States of America.

The United States
208 vs. Appellant,
American Can Co. et al.

The United States,
245 vs. Appellant,
The Quaker Oats Co. et al.

Corn Products Refining
Co. et al.,
578 vs. Appellants,
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, It is now here ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby continued.

The United States of America,
165 vs. Appellant,
The United States Steel Corporation et al.

The motion to continue this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, Mr. Attorney General Gregory and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant in support of the motion, and Mr. Richard V. Lindabury, Mr. Cordenio A. Severance, and Mr. David A. Reed, of counsel for the appellees in opposition thereto.

207 The United States, Appellant, vs. United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

The motion to continue this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, Mr. Attorney General Gregory and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant in support of the motion, and Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., and Mr. Malcolm Donald, of counsel for the appellees in opposition thereto.

48 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Reading Co., et al.

50 The Reading Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States of America, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file certain copies of the Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, and Mr. William Clarke Mason, of counsel for The Reading Company et al., a motion for leave to file additional documents concerning the same.

691 Robert F. Stroud, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a

643 The State of Missouri on the relation of The American Manufacturing Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. George D. Reynolds et al., Judges, etc., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Shepard Barclay, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. E. C. Rowe, of counsel for the defendants in error.

644 Minnie Eva Stadelman et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. H. Miner et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John M. Zane, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Guy C. H. Corliss, of counsel for the defendants in error.

117 E. W. Bliss Co., Appellant, vs. The United States

118 The United States, Appellant, vs. E. W. Bliss Co.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 7, rule 26.

103. Joseph Wille,
vs. Appellant.
Daniel C. Roper, First
Assistant Postmaster
General, etc.

This cause was a
by Mr. Daniel
Wright, of counsel
the appellant, a
Assistant to the
General Todd, f

for the appellee.

107 Supreme Lodge, Knights
of Pythias,
vs. Appellant.
Arthur V. H. Smyth.

This cause was a
by Mr. John J.
Hall, of counsel
appellant, and M
Harry V. Borst, f
c

sel for the appellee.

108 Harry Sussman,
vs. Appellant.
The Board of Education
of the School District
of Pittsburgh.

The argument of
cause was conc
by Mr. Andrew C
of counsel for the
The Court declin
hear further argu

109 Oscar J. Weeks, doing
business under the name
of O. J. Weeks & Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

This cause was sub
to the consideration
the Court on the
and printed argum
by Mr. Walter J.
Gunther of counsel f

petitioner, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, and
Assistant Attorney General Frierson of counsel f

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co.,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. E. Vasbinder.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. R. H. Ward, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co.,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Texas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Alexander H. McKnight, Mr. C. S. Burg, Mr. Joseph M. Bryson and Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. B. F. Looney and Mr. Luther Nickels of counsel for the defendant in error.

John L. Ketcham, Jr.,
[illegible] vs. Appellant,
Colonel Bill Burn et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William D. Williams, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. John J. Cartan, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, January 2nd, 1919

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eppa Hunton, Jr., it is ordered that J. D. Hank, Jr., Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that Alexander H. McKnight, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible]

Esquire, of New York City, and John M. Enright, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

702 Emma Goldman et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Harry Weinberger, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief in this cause.

123 Nannie E. Gibson,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John J. Lentz.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed, per stipulation of counsel.

128 George A. Fuller Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Otis Elevator Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward S. Duvall, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. John S. Flannery and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the respondent.

131 Armour & Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

This cause was argued by Mr. Eppa Hunton, Jr., of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr., of

119. Edmundo Ricaud et al. vs. The American Metal Co., Ltd. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed certificate with leave to counsel to file briefs within two weeks.

268. Henry A. Oetjen, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Central Leather Co.

269. Henry A. Oetjen, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Central Leather Co.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. John M. Enright, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday January 11th 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. E. Roberts, it is ordered that George Springmeyer, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. C. Ricketts, it is ordered that Allen W. Field of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

E. Zunts, Esquire, of New Orleans, and Alfred Riley Holt, Esquire, of Covington, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Capers, it is ordered that Edgar C. Van Dyke, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley H. Hadley, it is ordered that Daniel B. Trefethen, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Choate Jr., it is ordered that Harlow Morrell Davis, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Peter Breen, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsel-

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Harry T. Holt Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Batesville Southwestern
Railway Company and
The United States Fidelity
& Guaranty Co.,
257 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
M. H. Mims

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry A. Ostrom,
519 & 380 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Central [illegible] Co.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. John M. Enright, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Eli J. Blair, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John M. Enright of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

The Police Jury of the
Parish of Acadia,
116 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Crowley

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. P. Holt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. James E. Zunts and Mr. Philip S. Pugh, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. A. P. Holt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Edward Bates,
120 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lucia Bodie

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. E. Richter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Samuel J. Dunton, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. A. W. Field, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Peoples Tobacco Co., Ltd.,
124 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
American Tobacco Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edwin T. Merrick, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court adjourned

Monday, January 7th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rainey, it is ordered that Harry N. Rainey, Esquire, of Chicago, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. S. Ferguson, Jr., it is ordered that B. S. Womble, Esquire, of Winston Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

[illegible]

by Mr. D. M. Tibbetts it is ordered that Charles W. Grimes, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sherman T. McPherson, it is ordered that John R. Holmes, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert H. Putney, it is ordered that Albert Herschel de Ruffini, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Ottenberg, it is ordered that Grace Moscowitz, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, it is ordered that James Henry Langdon, Esquire, of Los Angeles and Henry Brockman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Clarke, it is ordered that Peter F. Rose, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Dalton Biggs, Esquire, of Ontario, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 5.

Theodore S. Rosen and Abraham Wagner, Petitioners,
vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern Dis

438 Victor Fortier,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting in part:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

6 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky and was argued by whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr Justice Brandeis.

76 The Houston Oil Co. of Texas, Kirby Lumber Co. and Maryland Trust Co., Petitioners, vs. Cornelia C. Goodrich et al.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

63 Caroline Boldt, Administratrix of the goods, chattels and credits of Edward J. Boldt, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

56

City of Cincinnati,
vs. Appellant
The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co. and The Ohio Traction Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke
Mr. Justice Brandeis

Monday, January 7th, 1918, continued.

The State of Wisconsin,
Original. vs. Complainant, In Equity.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings and proofs, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

The United States, Appellant,
vs.
J. S. Stearns Lumber Co.
Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.)

116 Union Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Minnie Rathbun Grosman et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

563 Henry R. Towne, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mark Eisner, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Third District of the State of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.
(Mr. Justice McKenna concurs in the result.)

The United States
vs.
Antonio Moreno

521.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first and second questions certified must be answered in the negative, and the third question in the affirmative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

92
David J. Walker Jr., Frank [illegible] E. Walker, Trustees under the last Will and Testament of David J. Walker, deceased, &c., Appellants,
vs.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

663. Joseph F. Arver, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be

Monday January 7th 1918 continued.

lfred F. Grahl,
Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

tto Wangerin,
Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript f the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ow here ordered and adjudged by this Court hat the judgment of the said District Court in his cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

alter Wangerin,
Plaintiff in Error,
he United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

681 Louis Kramer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

718 Meyer Gombard, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this same be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

[illegible] Albert Jones, vs. Appellant, H. W. Perkins, Deputy United States Marshal, and W. C. Whittle, Jailor of Richmond County, Georgia.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

[illegible] The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., vs. Appellant, The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Douglas, State of Colorado et al.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here

ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Co
this appeal be, and the same is hereby dis
the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Just

112.
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. E. Vasbinder.

In Error to the
Civil Appeal
Supreme Judic
State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the tran
the record from the Court of Civil Appeal
Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas,
argued by counsel. On consideration whereof
now here ordered and adjudged by this Cou
the judgment of the said Court of Civil Ap
this cause be, and the same is hereby revers
costs; and that this cause be, and the same
remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeal
further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Just

447
The State of Missouri on the relation of the [illegible] Manufacturing Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George D. Reynolds, Albert D. Nortoni and William H. Allen, Judges of the St. Louis Court of Appeals, &c., &c.

In Error
Supreme
of the
[illegible]

This cause came on to be heard on th

the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

644 Minnie Ennis Stadelman, Henry James Fletcher, and John H. Moseley,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. H. Miner and Charles [illegible]

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

15 The United States of America,
vs. Appellant,
Reading Company et al.

16 Reading Company et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States of America

On consideration of the motion for leave to file certain public documents herein, It is now here ordered by the

motion be, and the same is hereby granted.
per Mr. Chief Justice

778 William F. Brothers, Appellant, vs. The United States.

On consideration
motion for leave
and in forma pau
herein. It is now h
ordered by the Court that the said motion be,
the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice

857 Peter Chelentis, Petitioner, vs. Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc.

It is ordered by
Court that this ca
be placed on the
mary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice

684 Robert F. Stroud, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

On consideration
motion to advance
same, It is now h
ordered by the Cou
that said motion be, and the same is hereby gra
and the cause assigned for argument on Monda
March 4th next, after the cases heretofore ass
for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice

773 Southern Pacific Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Henry L. Bogert, Townsend Lawrence, and Anita Lawrence as Executors under the last will and testament of Walter B. Lawrence, deceased, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

781 Gulf Oil Corporation,
Petitioner,
vs.
E. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Monday, January 7th 1918

580 Henry W. Brennan,
Petitioner,
vs.
William Hale Thompson,
Mayor, and Charles C.
Healy, Superintendent of
Police of the City of Chicago.

On petition
certiorari
Supreme Cour
State of Ill

On consideration of the petition for a writ
rari herein to the Supreme Court of the
Illinois, and of the argument of counsel
had, as well in support of as against the
it is now here ordered by this Court that
petition be, and the same is hereby denied

Per Mr. Chief Justi

771 Ng Chey Fong,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for
certiorari to the
States Circuit C
Appeals for the N

On consideration of the petition for a writ of
ari herein to the United States Circuit Court
for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument
thereupon had, as well in support of as again
same, it is now here ordered by this Court th
said petition be, and the same is hereby de

Per Mr. Chief Justice

771 Edward W. Morrison, Petitioner,
vs
Charles S. Newman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Appellant,
vs
United States Steel Corporation et al.

On consideration of the motion to continue this case until the next term, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

247 The United States, Appellant,
vs
United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

On consideration of the motion to continue this case until the next term, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

640
Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

Mr. Solicitor G
Davis, of coun
the respondent
mitted to the c
ration of the Court a motion to advance this c

126
J. H. Brader,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Rachel James, formerly
Rachel Reese.

On motion of M
Solicitor Genera
Davis, an exte
half hour is he
granted to file a
for The United States in this cause, within

457
H. A. A. Smith, Auditor
of the Panama Canal,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William H. Jackson.

Mr. John W. D
in behalf of coun
for the defendant
error, submitted t
consideration of th
Court a motion to advance this cause.

718
Atlantic Coast Line
Railroad Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Leah E. Tredway,
Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a
of certiorari herein
was submitted to t
consideration of th
Court by Mr. Wil
B. Mr. Thomas
support of the same

781 The Washington Post Co., Petitioner, vs. John Armstrong Chaloner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, and Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman in support of the same, and Mr. E. F. Colladay, Mr. John Ridout and Mr. H. S. Barger in opposition thereto.

788 Lee A. Whitehead et al., Petitioners vs. The United States of America

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Pitts in opposition thereto.

792. Pennsylvania Co., Petitioner, vs. Mary Price, Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Andrew Squire and Mr. William L. Day in support of the same, and Mr. Charles W. Sawyer in opposition thereto.

800 The Cent. Graham Coal Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Owen C. Staples.

The petition for a
of certiorari herein
submitted to the
eration of the Co

printed arguments by Mr. Rufus B. Ray, Mr. Sam
uel Herrick and Mr. Joseph W. Cox in suppo
the same, and Mr. Chas. E. Foster in oppo
thereto.

363. Boston Store of Chicago,
vs.
American Graphophone
Co., et al.

On motion of Mr
George C. Ma
that behalf, lea
hereby granted t
a brief in the

as amicus curiae.

784 Philadelphia & Reading
Railway Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Catharine Marland,
Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a
of certiorari herein
submitted to the
sideration of the C
by Mr. William C
Means and Mr. C

Nelson in support of the same.

796. Charles H. Morgan, as
Trustee, etc., et al.,
vs. Petitioners
The Butte Miners' Union.

The petition for a w
certiorari herein is
submitted to the c
sideration of the Court
printed arguments

Mr. Horace N. Hawkins in support of the sam
and Mr. Peter Bre

[illegible] Peoples Tobacco Co. Ltd.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
American Tobacco Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. E. T. Merrick, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James Parker and Mr. George Denegre of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. E. T. Merrick, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

[illegible] Archibald E. Brightman,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lake Erie & Western Railroad Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. William V. Rooker, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Samuel D. Miller, of counsel for the defendant in error.

[illegible] J. H. Bowden,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Rachel James formerly Rachel Reeves.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. A. Blythe, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, January 8th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene C. Brown, it is ordered that Jno. J. Adams, Esquire, of Lakewood, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Harold J. Baily, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.

V. Fitzpatrick, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Ball, it is ordered that Cullen F. Thomas, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jeremiah A. Costello, it is ordered that James J. O'Donohoe, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

143 J. H. Pound,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Rachel Jones, formerly
Rachel Stevens.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. D. M. Tibbetts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. M. Mosle and Mr. Joseph C. Stone, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. E. A. Blyth, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

145 Philip Nelson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Southern Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. L. Brooks, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr.

in error;

127	Southern Pacific Co. et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Darnell-Taenzer Lumber Co. et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Bond, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,
until

Wednesday, January 9th, 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses P. Kinkaid, it is ordered that William E. Shuman, Esquire, of North Platte, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward R. Johnston, it is ordered that William R. [illegible], Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Harry H. Bell, Esquire, of Steubenville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that Corey Wesley Smith Esquire, of Rayville, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

232 Southern Pacific Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Darnell-Taenzer Lumber Co. et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles H. Bates, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. Francis B. James of counsel for the defendants in error.

5 Original The State of Wyoming, Complainant, vs. The State of Colorado et al. It is ordered by the Court that eight hours be allowed for the re-argument of this cause, and that four counsel be allowed to take part in the oral argument for the defendants. The re-argument was commenced by Mr. N. E. Corthell, of counsel for the complainant and continued by Mr. Delph E. Carpenter and Mr. Fred Farrar of counsel for the defendants.

Proclamation being

Thursday, January 10th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Luther B. Way, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac R. Hitt, it is ordered that Hyman Lazarus, Esquire, of Bayonne, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr. it is ordered that Nelson B. Todd, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. R. E. L. Smith, it is ordered that T. Parker Veazey, Jr., Esquire, of Great Falls, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

5 Original.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
v.
The State of Colorado et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Fred Farrar and Mr. Delph E. Carpenter, of counsel for the defendants; Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, and Mr. Platt Rogers, of counsel for the defendants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. R. [illegible] it is ordered that Seth Tinsdale, Esquire, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter N. Chandler it is ordered that Joseph A. Seidman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

J. J. Henriques, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, is admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

481 The United States,
vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. Francis J. Rodney in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

128 George A. Fuller Co.
vs. Petitioner,
Otis Elevator Co.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be granted to file an additional brief for the respondent in this cause, and to Mr. E. J. Burrell of counsel for the petitioner, to file a reply thereto within ten days.

5, Original. The State of Wyoming,
vs. Complainant,
The State of Colorado et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Delph E. Carpenter of counsel for the defendants, and concluded by Mr. John W. Lacey of counsel for the complainant.

481 The United States,
vs. Appellant,
United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

It is ordered by the Court that five hours be allowed for the

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. W. Le Roy Brown, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, January 14th, 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that W. P. Strait, Esquire, of Morrilton, and James W. Mehaffy, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Horigan, it is ordered that Clarence O. McKay, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-
half by Mr. Luther B. Way it is ordered that
eorge Pilcher, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of
irginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that
harles E. Dow, Esquire, of Boston, State of
Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attor-
ney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. John W. Keener, it is ordered that S. E.
umphreys, Esquire, of Bristol, State of Virgi-
nia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and
counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accord-
ingly.

ohn L. Ketcham, Jr., Appellant, vs. sal Bill Burr, David Frackelton, James E. Spinger et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the District Court of the
nited States for the Eastern District of Michigan

whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

10. W. E. Martin, Jr.,
Trustee in Bankruptcy
of J. H. Wiggins,
Petitioner,
vs.
Commercial National
Bank of Macon, Ga.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

he Illinois Central
ailroad Co.,
vs. Appellant,
tate Public Utilities
ommission of Illinois et al.
tate Public Utilities Com-
ission of Illinois et al.,
vs. Appellants,
he United States, Interstate
ommerce Commission et al.

Appeals from the
District Court of
the United States
for the Northern
District of Illinois.

his cause came on to be heard on the transcript the record from the District Court of the United tates for the Northern District of Illinois on ap-eal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel. the consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, djudged and decreed by this Court that the rees of the said District Court in this cause, ppealed from be, and the same are hereby af-rmed; the appellants on each of the appeals pay one half of the costs respectively.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consider- and decision of this cause.

Monday, January 14th, 1918.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Texas.

[illegible]

In Error to the
of Civil Appeals
Third Supreme
ial District
State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transc
of the record from the Court of Civil Appea
Third Supreme Judicial District of the Sta
Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consi
tion whereof, It is now here ordered and adj
by this Court that the judgment of the said C
of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the sa
is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the ca
be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the sa
Court of Civil Appeals for further proceeding
not inconsistent with the opinion of this Cou

Per Mr. Justice

George A. Fuller Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Otis Elevator Co.

[illegible]

On writ of certiorari
the Court of Appeals
the District of Col

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
the record from the Court of Appeals of the Di
of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On con
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and a
judged by this Court that the judgment of the
Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same
hereby, reversed with costs and that the cause
[illegible]

this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Kramer and Morris Becker,
680 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Dis-hereby affirmed.

per Mr Chief Jus

Charles E. Ruthenberg, Alfred Wagenknecht, and Charles Baker, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

656

In Error to
trict Court
United Stat
Northern D
of Oh

This cause came on to be heard on the
of the record from the District Court of
States for the Northern District of Ohio,
argued by counsel. On consideration wh
It is now here ordered and adjudged by
Court that the judgment of the said Di
Court in this cause be, and the same is
affirmed.

per Mr Chief Justi

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

98

Motion for the
before judgm
It is order
the Board of T
which is in cont
moved the ques

its validity to afford no longer a basis for
action because it thereby became purely
not noticed in the arguments submitted
hearing. Attention of counsel is now directed
subject and permission granted to file

or before Monday, the 28th instant.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry Sussman,
vs. Appellant,
The Board of Education
of the School District of
Pittsburgh.

Appeal from the
District Court of the
United States for the
Western District of
Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

125
Archibald E. Brightman,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lake Erie & Western Rail-
road Co.

In Error to the District Court of the
United States for the
District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is

Chief Justice

11

Hitchman Coal & Coke Co.
Petitioner
vs.
John Mitchell, individually,
T. L. Lewis, individually, W.
B. Wilson, individually, et al.

On application for the punishment for a contempt of this Court, of Frank J. Hayes, individually and as President of the United Mine Workers of America; John L. Lewis, individually and as Vice President of the United Mine Workers of America; William Green, individually and as Secretary Treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America; John Moore, individually and as President of District 6, United Mine Workers of America; William Roy, individually and as President of Sub District 5 of District 6, United Mine Workers of America; Joe Rosmus, individually and as President of the Hitchman Local Union No. 2258, United Mine Workers of America, McMechen, West Virginia; D. W. Lewis, individually and as Secretary Treasurer of said Hitchman Local Union; Pete Rodman, Mike Sufawski, Steve Ruchinski et al.

It appearing that the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia, by its final decree made and entered January 18, 1913 in a certain cause in equity then depending in that court between the Hitchman Coal & Coke Company, plaintiff, and John Mitchell and others, defendants, did, among other things, adjudge, order and decree that the defendants named in said decree, individually and as officers of the United Mine

ndants, and servants and all persons then mem-
bers and thereafter becoming members of said United
ine Workers of America, and all persons combining
nd conspiring with said designated persons, should
e, and they were thereby perpetually enjoined and
estrained from interfering and from combining,
onspiring or attempting to interfere with the employes
f said Hitchman Coal & Coke Company, plaintiff,
or the purpose of unionizing plaintiff's mine without
laintiff's consent, and from doing or attempting to do
arious acts of interference with said employes, as by
eference to said final decree will more fully appear;
And it further appearing that the defendants
nst the said final decree appealed therefrom
o the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
ourth Circuit, which court, on June 1, 1914, upon
onsideration, reversed the said decree and ordered
hat said cause be remanded to the said District
ourt with directions to dismiss the plaintiff's bill,
ut at the same time stayed the said mandate
ending application of the said Hitchman Coal &
oke Company to the Supreme Court of the United
tates for a writ of certiorari; and that afterwards
nd on August 15, 1914 an appeal was allowed from
he decree of said Circuit Court of Appeals to the
upreme Court of the United States, and that in
ursuance thereof the record in said cause on ap-
eal was transmitted to the said Supreme Court;
nd that afterwards and on March 13, 1916, the said
upreme Court upon consideration, dismissed the

4695

tion granted a writ of certiorari to review
decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals and
that the record in appeal should stand a
to the writ of certiorari, and that the case
turn to the writ of certiorari be placed on
for argument;

And it further appearing that by rea
by reason of the premises the said Supreme Co
United States became and was vested with jur
tion to hear and determine the validity of th
cree of the United States District Court for t
ern District of West Virginia and the dec
of the United States Circuit Court of Appea
ing the same, and further that the said
of the District Court and the writ or order
tion issued in pursuance thereof remain
force and effect pending the hearing and
nation by the said Supreme Court of the
on appeal and on certiorari; and that said
tion continued at least until December 1
the said Supreme Court, having heard and
proceeded to determine the same;

And the said Supreme Court of the Un
being now informed by the said Mitchell
Coke Company that while said Court was
jurisdiction of said cause the respondents
named, having notice of the said decree an
tion of the District Court of the United Sta
Northern District of West Virginia, and of
diction of the said Supreme Court of the

and out of Indiana; did combine and conspire for the purpose of interfering and did attempt to interfere with the employees of said Hitchman Coal & Coke Company, plaintiff, for the purpose of unionizing its said mine without its consent, and to that end did knowingly and willfully (having knowledge of the relationship of employer and employee and of the contract of service) entice, induce, and persuade, and attempt to entice, induce, and persuade, many of plaintiff's employees to break their contracts of service and to leave the service and employ of plaintiff without plaintiff's consent, against its will, and to its injury; and to the same end (knowing of the relationship of employer and employee and of the contract of employment) did knowingly and willfully induce and persuade, and attempt to induce and persuade, many of said plaintiff's employees to join the United Mine Workers of America and form a local union of the said United Mine Workers of America at the said Hitchman mine, and did attempt to compel the unionization of said mine without the consent of said plaintiff; and did commit various other acts contrary to the prohibition of the decree and injunction of the said District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia and in contempt of the said Supreme Court of the United States and of its authority and jurisdiction in said cause; and good cause being shown for the making of this order:

It is ordered that the said respondents, Frank, Monday, January 14th, 1918 an

Mine Workers of America, John L. Lewis, in
ually and as Vice President of the United M
Workers of America, William Green, indiv
and as Secretary-Treasurer of the United M
Workers of America, John Moore, individ
as President of District 6, United Mine Wo
America, William Roy, individually and as P
dent of Sub District 5 of District 6, Unite
Workers of America, Joe Newman, individu
as President of Hitchman Local Union, No
United Mine Workers of America, Mc Mec
West Virginia, D. W. Lewis, individually an
Secretary-Treasurer of said Local Union, Th
lovic, Mike Olefanski, and Steve Kochinet
show cause before the said Supreme Court of
United States at the Capitol in Washingt
Monday, the fourth day of March, A. D. on
sand nine hundred and eighteen, at the h
twelve o'clock noon, or as soon thereafter as th
Court can hear the matter, why they and
them should not be adjudged guilty of a co
of the said Supreme Court of the United Sta
of its authority and jurisdiction, and punish
cordingly.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

H. A. A. Smith,
Auditor of the Panama
Canal,
457 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William H. Jackson.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago & Alton
Railroad Company,
600 vs. Petitioner,
The United States of
America.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Steel Foundries
432 vs. Petitioner,
The Tri City Central
Trades Council et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

The Washington Post Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
John Armstrong Chaloner.

791

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Leah E. Tredway, Administratrix of Edward C. Tredway, Deceased.

785

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

758	Isaac N. Whitehead, J. E. Whitehead, L. F. Harris, and The Standard Home Company, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

791	Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Catharine Marland, Administratrix of the Estate of William Edgar Marland, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

793 Pennsylvania Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Mary Price Adminis-
tratrix of the Estate
of Charles Price, deceased.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the Court
of Appeals, Cuyahoga
County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel [illegible] in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles H. Moyer,
as Trustee for The
Western Federation
of Miners, et al.,
794 vs. Petitioners
The Butte Miners' Union.

On petition for writ
of certiorari to the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for
the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The [illegible] Land Co.
vs. Petitioner.
Owen C. Staples

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

[illegible]

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States,
Original Petitioner.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted

to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file an information for contempt in this cause.

567

The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Fred W. Weitzel

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

846

Harry Ward Roots,
vs. Plaintiff in Error

Mr. Thomas R. Shepard, of counsel for the de-mitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause under the thirty-second rule.

23 Original.
The State of Georgia,
vs. Complainant,
The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway et al.

Mr. William A. Wimbish, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for the appointment of an examiner to take testimony in this cause.

785
Charles A. Peabody,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mark Eisner, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Mr. A. A. Hickling, Jr., in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

803
Deschutes Railroad Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Eastern Oregon Land Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. A. C. Spencer and Mr. James G. Wilson in support of the same.

750
Aurelio P. Bernal,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

[illegible]

support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

805 Norfolk County Water Co., Petitioner,
vs.
City of Norfolk, Virginia, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Luther R. Way in support of the same, and Mr. George Pilcher in opposition thereto.

193 Iron Hill Mining Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Henry Olson et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. John W. Kerner, of counsel for the defendants in error in support of the same.

[illegible] Minnie C. Gibson, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John J. Lentz.

In Error to the Court of Appeals Second Judicial District of the State of Ohio

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, 207 The United States, Appellant, vs. United Shoe Machinery Co. of New Jersey et al.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. La Rue Brown of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles F. Choate Jr., and Mr. Frederick P. Fish, of counsel for the appellees.

11 Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner, vs. John Mitchell et al.

Upon consideration of the motion filed by the Hitchman Coal & Coke Company November 28, 1917, It is ordered that the mandate in this case be stayed until the further order of this Court, and that a rule issue, returnable March 4, 1918, against Frank J. Hayes, individually and as President of the United Mine Workers of America, John L. Lewis individually and as Vice President of the United Mine Workers of America, William Green, individually and as Secretary-Treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America, John Moore, individually and as President of District 6 United Mine Workers of America, William Roy individually and as President of Sub-District 5 of District 6, United Mine Workers of America, Jo. [illegible], individually and as President of the Hitchman Local Union, No. 3258 United Mine Workers of America McMechen, West Virginia, D. W. Lewis individually and as Secretary-Treasurer of said Local Union, Pete Bartone, Mike [illegible], and Steve [illegible] to show cause why they should not be adjudged guilty of a contempt of this Court and of its authority and punished accordingly.

It is further ordered that a motion of said Hutchinson Coal & Coke Company for a rule to show cause against Jacob Semachovich, individually and as President of the Glendale Local Union No. 3536, United Mine Workers of America, Glendale, West Virginia, C. M. McCabe, individually and as Secretary-Treasurer of said Local Union, Tom Bruce, Virgil Freeman, Jim Murray and Jim Barton, be denied without prejudice.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 15th 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd it is ordered that J. Paul Lamb, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fisher Siegel it is ordered that Henry S. Morell, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by
Mr.

H. Woodson, Esquire, of Buxton, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

207. The United States, Appellant, vs. United Shoe Machinery Co of New Jersey et al.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. H. La Rue Brown, of counsel for the appellant.

180. Great Northern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. C. Alexander, Administrator, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr., of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Cornelius B. Nolan of counsel for the defendant in error.

75. The United States, Appellant, vs. St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway Co., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellant and continued by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr. of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis J. Kearful, it is ordered that Nathan H. Chase, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac Siegel, it is ordered that Jacob Rosenbaum, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

678
Nat. C. McNaughton,
vs. Appellant,
W. D. Stephens, Governor,
etc., et al.

679
L. E. Nisbett et al.,
vs. Appellants,
W. D. Stephens, Governor,
etc., et al.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Tom L. Johnston, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. U. S. Webb, Mr. Robert M. Clark and Mr. Thomas Lee Woolwine, of counsel for the appellees.

75
The United States,
vs. Appellant,
St. Paul, Minneapolis &
Manitoba Railway Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr., of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellant.

763
Boston Store of Chicago
vs.
American Graphophone Co.
et al.

On motion of Mr. James M. Beck, of counsel for the American Graphophone Company et al., three hours are allowed for the oral argument of this cause and three counsel allowed to argue the case for the American Graphophone Co. et al. The argument was commenced by Mr. Walter Bachrach, of counsel for the Boston Store of Chicago; continued by Mr. [illegible] R. [illegible], Mr. Daniel N. Kirby and Mr.

4999

phone Company et al. and concluded by Mr. Hamilton Moses, of counsel for the Boston Store of Chicago.

575 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Edmund Bathgate et al.

576 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John J. Buchanan et al.

577 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Harry Coons et al.

578 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Farrell et al.

579 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Otto Rheyer et al.

580 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Robert Uncks et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, January 17th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that M. G. Bufum, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen, it is ordered that William C. Fraser, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Patterson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. [illegible], it is ordered that Edward Elliott Harry, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Dyer, it is ordered that Vital W. Garesché, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. A. Welles, it is ordered that A. S. Hurley and Lucian W. McLemore, Esquires, of Sumter, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julian B. [illegible], it is ordered that W. L. Grim, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ohn H. Evans, Trustee,
vs. Appellant,
he City of Akron

On motion of Mr. A. H. Ferguson in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief
in this cause as amicus curiae.

he United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
dward Bathgate et al.
he United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
ohn J. Buckhannon et al.
he United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
arry Evans et al.
he United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
illiam Farrell et al.
he United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
tto Kleyne et al.
he United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
obert Hooks et al.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John R. Holmes and Mr. Sherman T. McPherson, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

he United States of America,
ant. vs.
Woo Jan

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for The
nited States of America, et al., and submitted, on a.

counsel for Mr. J.

534 The People of Porto Rico et al., Appellants,
vs.
Carlos Tapia
605 The People of Porto Rico et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Jose Muratti

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the appellants and plaintiffs in error; and continued by Mr. Willis Sweet, of counsel for the appellee and defendant in error, and Mr. C. S. Bailey, of counsel for the appellants and plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, January 18th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today
t the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. Lindley M. Hadley, it is ordered that W. G.
Hanna, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington,
admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-
llor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. F. H. Dominick, it is ordered that C. N.
pp, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Caro-
ina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and
unsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

D. Hawk and Samuel S. Holmes, Esqu
Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted t
as attorneys and counsellors, and they we
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court i
by Mr. Peter G. Gerry, it is ordered that
T. Hagan and Patrick H. J. Gerry, Esqu
Providence, State of Rhode Island, be ad
practice as attorneys and counsellors of th
and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
by Mr. J. S. Ashbaugh, it is ordered that
J. McKee, Esquire, of Detroit, State of M
be admitted to practice as an attorney an
sellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac

534 The People of Porto Rico et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Carlos Tapia
647 The People of Porto Rico et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Jose Morales

The argum
these caus
closed by
Bailey of co
the appellan
plaintiffs in

685 Ernest J. McCurdy,
County Treasurer, etc., et al.,
vs. Appellants
The United States.

This cause c
by Mr. Custe
of counsel fo
Appellants an
entitled the

[illegible]

584. J. Knox Greer, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. C. Denton, of counsel for the petitioner and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the respondent.

371. The Railroad Commission of the State of California, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Douglas Brookman, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Robert Dunlap, of counsel for the defendant in error.

525. Carey W. Stone, Guardian, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Emmett P. Stone, next friend of Thomas S. Stone

This cause was argued by Mr. Clyde A. Douglass, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Robert W. Winston, of counsel for the defendant in error.

282. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ella Dalton, as Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. W. McLemore, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. S. Harby, of counsel for the defendant in error.

273	The Postal Telegraph Cable Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The City of Newport, Kentucky.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John C. Schmidt of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned
until Monday next

Monday January 21st, 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fayette B. Dow, it is ordered that Silas Blake Axtell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Wilson, it is ordered that Albert Sabath and Ode L. Rankin, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

C. McCulloch, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that Frank E. Curley, Esquire, of Tucson, and Leonard Kinney, Esquire, of Clifton, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Othilia C. Beals and Walter Burges Beals, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that Henry S. Parker, Esquire, of Yoakum, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

108 Union Pacific Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Ella Huxoll, Administratrix of the Estate of Fred J. Huxoll, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

172 Southern Pacific Co.
et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Darnell-Taenzer Lumber
Co. et al.

In Error to the United
States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the
Sixth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

120

Edward Bates,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Lucia Bodie.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

— Original

Ex parte, The United States,
Petitioner.

Motion for leave to file an Information for Contempt.

Order.

The Clerk will transmit a copy of the motion to the Judge therein referred to and consideration thereof be postponed until Monday February 4th next, leave being granted him by that date to submit in print such suggestions as he may deem appropriate to be taken into view in considering and disposing of the motion for leave to file.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Police Jury of the Parish of Vermilion,
86. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Crowley.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.,
282. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ella Dutton, as Administratrix of the Estate of Lee Dutton, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California, 391 vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Carey W. Stone, Guardian of Thomas S. Stone, 525 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Emmett P. Stone, next friend of Thomas S. Stone	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of Porto Rico, Epifanio Plaza and Alonso Padial, Appellants, vs. Carlos Tapia	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

534

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of Porto Rico and Charles E. Foote, Judge of the District Court of Mayaguez, Plaintiffs in Error and Petitioners, vs. Jose Muratti	In Error and on writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

547

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, re-the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

678

Kate P. McNaughton, Appellant,
vs.
W. D. Stephens, Governor of the State of California, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

679

L. E. Nisbett and Robert J. Burdette, Appellants,
vs.
W. D. Stephens, Governor of the State of California, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

23 Original

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
vs.
The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway and The Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Company.

On consideration of the joint motion and stipulation of counsel for the respective parties in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that Edward L. Gilmore, of Atlanta, Georgia, be, and he is hereby, appointed to take and return the testimony and evidence in this cause; that the said Examiner shall take and transcribe the oral testimony offered, and return a fair transcript thereof to the Clerk of this Court in the manner and according to the methods provided in the Federal Equity Rules for the taking of testimony before an Examiner; that he shall receive such documentary evidence as may be offered in behalf of either party, and shall transmit the same to the Clerk of this Court, together with a brief memorandum stating by whom the evidence was offered, and any objections that may be made thereto; that such stipulations of facts as the parties may agree upon and enter into may either be received by the Examiner, and by him transmitted to the Clerk of this Court as a part of the record, or such stipulations may be sent direct to the Clerk of the Court if the

It is further ordered that the taking of testimony before the Examiner on behalf of the complainant shall begin on January 28th, 1918, at eleven o'clock A.M., or such early day thereafter as counsel for the respective parties shall agree upon, and shall be completed within thirty days next ensuing. Upon the completion of the taking of the testimony in chief the defendants shall within thirty days thereafter take their evidence in defense, negative and affirmative. Should further time be desired by complainant to take evidence in reply, and in case the defendants should desire to offer evidence in rejoinder, each party shall have ten days, respectively, within which to present such evidence.

The testimony shall be taken at such times and places as counsel for the respective parties may agree upon, or, in the absence of such agreement, may be taken in accordance with the requirements of Federal Equity Rule No. 53; Provided, however, that the times for taking the evidence as above prescribed may be extended by agreement or by the Examiner on the application of either party upon reasonable notice to the other party and opportunity given to be heard; that forthwith after the taking of the testimony and the submission of documentary evidence shall have been completed, the Examiner shall make up a record of the proceedings had, and transmit the same, to the Clerk of this Court, which record shall include the documentary evidence submitted, together with the original transcript of the oral testimony taken before him of this Court upon receipt thereof;

It is further ordered that the said Examiner shall receive as his sole compensation for all services rendered and for all testimony taken and transcribed the sum of $10.00 per day for each day when actually engaged in the taking of testimony and the reception of evidence, and the further sum of 25 cents per page for each page of the testimony transcribed, and the further sum of 12½ cents per page for each carbon copy thereof, together with reasonable traveling expenses actually incurred in the taking of the testimony.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Fred. W. Wetzel

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Charles A. Peabody,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mark Eisner, Collector of Internal Revenue

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the

4th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

806. Navy Yard Route, vs. (Plaintiffs in Error,) H. E. Devlin

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, but the case will be taken as submitted on printed briefs if counsel are so advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

195 Idora Hill Mining Co., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Harry Olson et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on a motion of counsel for the defendants in error to dismiss the writ of error herein for failure to print the transcript of the record. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs and five per centum damages.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

759 Andres P. Bernal, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

803 Deschutes Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Eastern Oregon Land Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

805 Norfolk County Water Co., Petitioner,
vs.
City of Norfolk, Virginia, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Monday January 21st 1918, continued

herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles E. Ruthenberg et al.,
656 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.
Joseph F. Arch,
663 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.
Alfred F. Grabel,
664 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.
Otto Wangerin,
665 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.
Walter Wangerin,
666 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.
Louis Kramer & Morris Becker,
680 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.
Louis Kramer,
681 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.
Albert Jones
738 vs. Appellant,

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for The United States of America, It is ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby granted to issue the mandates in these cases.

hilster, et al.
ayne Trumbard,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
he United States of America

Emma Goldman and
lexander Berkman,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
the United States.

The motion that the mandate in this case issue at once was submitted to the Court on printed arguments
y Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of
unsel for the defendant in error, in support of the
tion, and Mr. Harry Weinberger, of counsel for the
laintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

nternational News
ervice,
vs. Petitioner,
the Associated Press.

Mr. Laurence Koenigsberger, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to ad-
ance this cause.

J. F. McGinnis et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
e People of the State of
alifornia.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court
hat these cases be, and they are hereby passed
emporarily.

Monday, January 21st, 1918, continued

581

The State of Ohio on the relation of The Hartford Life Insurance Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Alonzo J. Doud et al. Judges, &c.

The motion to affirm in this cause or to place the cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Smith W. Bennett in support of the same, and Mr. James C. Jones and Mr. Henry R. Arnold in opposition thereto.

1142

City of Birmingham
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
D. J. O'Connell

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued, per stipulation of counsel.

273.

The Postal Telegraph Cable Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Newport, Kentucky.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John R. Schindel, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Brent Spence, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John R. Schindel, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

476

Steamship Bowdoin Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ira A. Campbell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Christopher M.

the defendants in error.

378 New York Life Insurance Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lee F. Dodge.

This cause was argued by Mr. James H. McIntosh, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James J. O'Donohoe, of counsel for the defendant in error.

27 Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Frank M. Slater, etc., Petitioner.

This cause was argued by Mr. George B. Webster, of counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Jacob Chasnoff, of counsel for the respondent.

[illegible] John H. Sears, Trustee, Appellant, vs. The City of Akron.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George W. Wickersham, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, January 22d, 19

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court, m
at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief J
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Mars
James D. Maher, Cler

Proclamation being made, the Court is op

On motion first made to the Court in cha
by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that
R. Holmes, Esquire, of Yazoo City, State of
be admitted to practice as an attorney and c
of this Court, and he was sworn according

147. Louis H. Dunn,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. M. Ridpath

Mr. Fred B.
counsel for the p
in error, suggest
death of W. M.
the defendant in error in this cause, and m
Court to make Mary Ridpath Anthony, as
of the said W. M. Ridpath, deceased, the
fendant in error herein, as per stipulation
Whereupon, [illegible]

the said Mary Ridpath Anthony as Executrix of W. M. Ridpath, deceased, be, and she is hereby, made the party defendant in error in this cause in place of the said W. M. Ridpath, deceased.

144 Helen C. Shenkle, Surviving Executrix of Barton Shenkle, deceased, Appellant, vs. The District of Columbia

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

145 Robert Miller and William Conney, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. B. O. McLain

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued, per stipulation of counsel.

185 John H. Evans, Trustee, Appellant, vs. The City of Akron

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George W. Wickersham, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. John E. Morley, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. George W. Wickersham, of counsel for the appellant.

138 Charles F. Ruddy, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas J. Rossi

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is here-

Tuesday, January 22d, 1918, continued

Hannah L. Andrews,
Executrix, etc.,
1411 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Nix & Co.

Hannah L. Andrews,
Executrix, etc.,
1412 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph D. Hendrickson

These causes were argued by Mr. Samuel H. Richards, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Henry F. Stockwell, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Emil Eiger et al.
1413 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Delia Garrity

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. J. Pflaum, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 23d, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. T. Bledsoe, it is ordered that J. R. Cottingham, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, it is ordered that Philip S. Dunn, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Northern Pacific Railway Co.,
152. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Emma A. Wismer, administratrix, etc.

[illegible]

On motion of Mr. F. J. Kearful on behalf of counsel for the defendant in error It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section 9 rule 26.

Stonebraker Zea Candy Co.,
84 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry B. Martin of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellee.

Motion Picture Patents Co et al.,
155 vs. Appellants,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Melville Church of counsel for the appellants It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

Emil Eigen et al.,
143 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Delia Gormly

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. J. Pflaum of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Otto L. Hamilton of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. A. J. Pflaum

Wednesday, January 23d, 1918, continued

Louis H. Dimm
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Ridpath Anthony,
as Executrix, etc.
H. J. Cunning et al.
[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Ella Morrison et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Fred B. Merrill, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Reese H. Voorhees, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Puget Sound Traction,
Light & Power Co., et al.,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Fred W. Newell et al., Commissioners, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. G. McLaren, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Thursday, January 24th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. J. McLean, it is ordered that John B. Fogarty, Esquire, of Everett, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robt. L. Robson, it is ordered that William Waugh Adams, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Edward M. Cleary, it is ordered that Henry L. Graham, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

148 Puget Sound Traction, Light & Power Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Fred W. Nuttle et al., Commissioners, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. G. McLaren, of counsel for the defendants in error, and the cause was submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. James B. Howe, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

153 The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Paul D. Cole.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Scott, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Alfred M. Jackson and Mr. Charles T. Atkinson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

154 Alice State Bank et al., Petitioners, vs. Houston Pasture Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Taft, of counsel for the petitioners; continued by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Walter P. Napier, of counsel for the petitioners. Leave was

[illegible] being made, the
[illegible] argument under [illegible]

Friday, January 2nd 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Scott, it is ordered that Thomas B. S. O'Dea, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Borland, it is ordered that Fred A. Boxley, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Charles Curtis, it is ordered that Joseph M. Stark, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that Francis W. Wozencraft Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Millan, it is ordered that James McCabe and F. G. Dorety, Esquires, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

524 William J. Anicker,
vs. Appellant,
David Gunsburg et al.

Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellants, suggested the death of David Gunsburg one of the appellees in this case, and moved the Court to make Bertha H. Gunsberg, Ralph Hochstetter and Walter P. Cooke, Administrators and sole personal representatives of the said David Gunsberg, deceased, parties appellees herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Bertha H. Gunsberg, Ralph Hochstetter and Walter P. Cooke, Administrators and

Ginsberg, deceased, be, and they are hereby made parties appellees in this cause.

167 John E. Roller,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lindsay M. Armentrout

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John E. Roller pro se and Mr. Ewell Dulaney Jr., of counsel for the defendant in error.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas,
156 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. P. Schwartz et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. C. S. Berry and Mr. A. H. McKnight, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.

H. B. Talley,
157 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Daniel S. Burgess et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas D. Lyons, of counsel for the defendants in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. H. B. Talley pro se.

158 Gulf Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Texas

This cause was argued by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. B. F. Looney and Mr. Luther Nickels, of counsel for the defendant in error.

160 Nicholas V. Bilby et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Albert Stewart et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. George C. Crump, of counsel for the defendants in error.

161 The Arizona Copper Co., Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph B. Hammer,

162 The Arizona Copper Co., Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard Bray

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Ernest W. Lewis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Frank E. Curley and Mr. L. Kearney, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. John A. Garver, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, January 28th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present,
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Lane D. Webber, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that S. Hazen Bond, Esquire, of the District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first

by Mr. Conrad H. Syme it is ordered that Ralph B. Fleharty, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, it is ordered that Brent Whitehead Blythe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Pierce it is ordered that Phil D. Swing, Esquire, of El Centro, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. R. Bryant, it is ordered that Faust F. Crampton, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that John J. Sprunt, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

by Mr. William N. King it is ordered that Edmund W. Rice, Esquire, of Globe, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clifton V. Edwards it is ordered that Lawrence R. Sager, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Ralph B. Applewhite, Esquire, of Brownstown, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

187.	Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Appellant, vs. Arthur W. H. Smyth	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is here the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Clarke.

The Northern Ohio Traction & Light Co, and
The Cleveland Trust Co,
60 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Ohio on the relation of Hubert C. Pontius, Prosecuting Attorney of Stark County, Ohio.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

Dissenting:
Mr Justice Clarke
Mr Justice Brandeis
Mr Justice Day took no part in the consideration

99. The United States, Appellant, vs. Frederick A. Sweet, Administrator of the Estate of Arthur A. Sweet, deceased. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

(Mr. Justice McReynolds did not participate in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

348. Southern Pacific Co. vs. (Radcliffe Exr. Frank R. Stewart. On consideration of the petition for rehearing submitted in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said petition be filed, and the petition is hereby granted. It is further ordered that the judgment entered herein on December 17, 1917, be, and the same is hereby vacated and set aside,

298 James Grace, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

96 Edward F. Johnson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. D. Lankford and Southwestern Surety Insurance Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

98 Lawrence Martin, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. D. Lankford and Southwestern Surety Insurance Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

386 The United States of America and [illegible] Thomas
vs.
Woo Jan.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, 53 vs. Paul D. Cole.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and ten per cent. damages.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas, Plaintiff in Error, 156 vs. W. C. Schwartz and Texas Midland Railroad Co.	In Error to the County Court of Kaufman County, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the County Court of Kaufman

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said County Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said County Court for further proceedings.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

84. Stonebraker Zea Cattle Co., Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

167 John E. Roller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lindsay M. Armentrout. In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of

he State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.
On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered
and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error
n this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed
n the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

he State of Ohio on the lation of The Hartford fe Insurance Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, lonzo J. Dowds and Frank Rathbell et al., Judges of the ommon Pleas Court of and Franklin, County, Ohio	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

his cause came on to be heard on the transcript of
e record from the Supreme Court of the State of
hio, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which
s argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is
w here ordered and adjudged by this Court that
e writ of error in this cause be, and the same is
eby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

mma Goldman and lexander Berkman, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, e United States.	On consideration of the motion that the mandate in this cause issue at once, It is now here ordered by

is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice W

368	International News Service, Petitioner, vs. The Associated Press.	On consideration motion to advan cause, It is now dered by the Cour the said motion

the same is hereby granted, and the cause as
for argument on Monday, April 15th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice W

The Chief Justice announced that the Cour
take a recess from Monday, February 4 to M
March 4 next.

Original.	Ex parte, In the matter of The United States, Petitioner.	Mr. Solicitor Gen Davis, of counsel petitioner, submit the consideration Court a motion

leave to amend information for contempt in th

704	W. C. Hammer, United States Attorney &c., Appellant, vs. Roland H. Dagenhart et al.	Mr. Solicitor Gen Davis, of counsel the appellant, su ted to the considera of the Court a m to advance this ca

S. L. Nunnerly,
Administrator, etc.,
888 vs. Petitioner,
Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Conrad H. Syme in support of the same, and Mr. B. D. Warfield in opposition thereto.

Watts, Watts & Co.,
Limited,
190 vs. Petitioner,
Unione Austriaca
Di Navigazione, etc.

Mr. L. Russell Alden in behalf of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to pass this cause which was opposed by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

The Western Union
Telegraph Co.,
584 vs. Appellant,
The Baltimore & Ohio
Railroad Co.

Mr. J. M. Hartfield, in behalf of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause, and leave was granted Mr. Bynum E. Hinton, of counsel for the Postal Telegraph-Cable Company to file a brief as amicus curiae in opposition to the motion

Edward Streeter, as Trustee, etc.,
812. vs. Petitioner,
Marian A. Patterson and H. J. Patterson.

The petition fo
of certiorari h
submitted to th
sideration of the C
Mr. Charles J. K
in support of th

William H. Miner,
178 vs. Petitioner,
The T. H. Symington Co.
The T. H. Symington Co.,
226 vs. Petitioner,
The National Malleable Castings Co. et al.

On motion of
F. Macklin, in
of counsel, it is
by the Court th
cause be, and
are hereby gran

Rigney & Co.,
807. vs. Petitioner
Aunt Jemima Mills Co.

The petition for
of certiorari h
submitted to the
sideration of the Co

printed arguments by Mr. T. J. Crompton an
J. K. Bryant in support of the same, and M
Frank F. Reed and Mr. Edward S. Rogers
sition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Michael Quinn,
— Original Petitioner.

Mr. William C.
of counsel for the
be submitted to t
sideration of the C

motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of
[illegible] in the cause.

Monday, January 28th, 1918 continued.

769 El Paso Sash & Door Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, E. M. Conaway. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank C. Morris in support of the same, and Mr. Charles B. Braun in opposition thereto.

603 Ray Consolidated Copper Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Dan Veazey. This cause was argued by Mr. William H. King of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendant in error. Leave granted Mr. Edward H. Rice to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

88 George W. Egan, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles E. McDonald. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George W. Egan pro se, and Mr. Charles O. Bailey and Mr. John H. Voorhees, of counsel for the defendant in error.

164 William J. Anicker, vs. Appellant, Bertha H. Gunsburg et al., Administrators, etc., et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. George S. Ramsey of counsel for the appellees

Monday, January 20th, 1908 cont

144 Helen C. Stickle,
surviving Executrix, etc.,
vs. Appellant.
The District of Columbia.

This cause was
by Mr. John
counsel for the
and Mr. Ormsb
ny Counsel, Th

of counsel for the appellee.

152 Northern Pacific Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Emma A. Wismer, substituted, etc.

The argument
cause was cont
by Mr. Charles
nelly of counsel
plaintiffs in err

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned
until tomorrow at twelve o'c

Tuesday, January 29th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. R. Johnston, it is ordered that Richmond Weed, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

726. J. H. Brader, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Rachel James, formerly Rachel Reeves.

On motion of Mr. William W. Hastings, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief herein.

152. Northern Pacific Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Emma A. Wiemer, substituted, etc.

The argument of
cause was continued
by Mr. Charles D
nelly, of counsel f
plaintiff in error,

concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General
of counsel for the defendant in error.

168 Marconi Wireless Telegraph
Co. of America,
vs. Petitioner,
Emil J. Simon

The argument of
cause was commen
by Mr. L. F. H.
of counsel for the
titioner, continue
Mr. Walter H. Pumphrey, of counsel for the re
ent, and concluded by Mr. John W. Griggs, of
sel for the petitioner.

393. William Cramp & Sons
Ship & Engine Building
Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
International Curtis Marine Turbine Co. et al.

The argument of
cause was commen
by Mr. Clifton V.
wards, of counsel f
the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourn
until

Wednesday, January 30th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Whelan, it is ordered that John A. Lawler, Esquire, of Hastings, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Dyer, it is ordered that Arthur Stahl, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Hugh Satterlee, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Jno. L. Williams, it is ordered that Charles Ashton Noone, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

756	B. F. Looney, Attorney General, etc., et al., vs. Appellants, Eastern Texas Railroad Co. et al.	Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
393.	William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., vs. Petitioner, International Curtis Marine Turbine Co., et al.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Abraham M. Beitler, of counsel for the petitioner.
169	Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al., vs. Appellants, John L. Morrison, Jr., etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the appellants and Mr. Webster Ballinger of counsel for the appellee.

Wednesday, January 30th, 1918, continued.

173 John P. Bergan, Plaintiff in Error, v. The National Surety Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John A. Cline, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Hardwick, it is ordered that Louis Stone Moore, Esquire, of Thomasville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

181 Bert Williams et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
A. P. Sandles et al.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record.
It is, therefore, on

Court; now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs,

per Mr. Chief Justice White

183 Adams State Bank, vs. Plaintiff in Error. The People of the State of Illinois

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued per stipulation of counsel.

171 John P. Brogan, vs. Plaintiff in Error. The National Surety Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John A. Cline, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. John M. Garfield of counsel for the defendant in error.

172. Great Northern Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error. Adeline Donaldson, as Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. G. Dorety, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James McCabe, of counsel for the defendant in error.

83 Rock Spring Distilling Co., et al. vs. Petitioners. W. A. Gaines & Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Luther Ely Smith, of counsel for the petitioners.

conclusion arguments, the Court
[illegible]

Tuesday, February 26th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Coulter Wells, it is ordered that William W. Spalding, Esquire, of Lebanon, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

38 Rock Spring Distilling Co. et al., Petitioners,
vs.
W. A. Gaines & Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lucien Ely Smith of counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Edmund F. Trabue and Mr. James L. Hopkins, of counsel for the re-of counsel for the petitioners.

179 Ford Motor Co., Appellant, vs. John S. Chambers, as Controller of the State of California, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. F. Williamson, of counsel for the appellant, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. Raymond Benjamin, of counsel for the appellees

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, February 4th, 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. L. Morrill, it is ordered that Samuel S. Buslin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Elliott, it is ordered that Henry N. Quigley, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. [illegible]

C. Butterfield, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, and William Glenn Terrell, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred B. Crossley, it is ordered that Tom D. Smith, Esquire, of Hiawatha, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupré, it is ordered that Frederick Archibald Copestake, Esquire, of Stockton, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Farrington, it is ordered that Herman H. Phleger and Charles E. Townsend, Esquires, of San Francisco, and Horace Marden Albright, Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, it is ordered that Rebecca Lawrence Lowe, and Walter Holbrook McClenon admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney it is ordered that Oscar Chrystie, Esquire, of New York City, and Samuel E. Darby, jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Oscar J. Weeks, doing business under the name of O. J. Weeks & Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

109.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

28 A. C. Hillmayer, Trustee for Margaret Zengerle, vs. Alfred Coleman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Georgian Bay Co.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first and second questions certified must be answered in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

97 William Filene's Sons Co., Petitioner, vs. Charles F. Weed, Wilmot H. Osborne, and Edmund D. Wilson, Receivers of William S. Butler & Co. Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court be, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis, having been counsel, took no part in the decision of this case.)

Robert H. Gardiner, Trustee of the Perry Real Estate Trust, Petitioner, vs. William S. Butler & Co., Inc., et al.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Ap- peals for the First Circuit.

95

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

369 El Paso Sash & Door Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, E. M. Cummings

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Michael Quinn, Petitioner. — Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Michael Quinn, Petitioner. — Original

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here

Monday, February 11th, 1918

Honorable Edmund R. Campbell, Chi
the United States Court of Claims, a
ciates Fenton W. Booth, Samuel S. Bar
Downey and James Hay, Justices of
before this Court, at the City of Washi
day, March 4th, 1918, or as soon thereaf
can be heard, why the prayer of said pe
not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Jus

The Western Union Telegraph Co.,
554 vs. Appellant,
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

On considera
motion to d
cause, It is o
ordered by th
said motion
same is hereby
without prejudice to a renewal of same.

Per Mr. Chief Ju

W. C. Hammer, United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina,
704 vs. Appellant,
Roland H. Dagenhart and R Dagenhart and John Dagenhart, minors, by Roland H. Dagenhart, their next friend

On considera
motion to
case, It is o
dered by th
said motion
same is here
and the ca
for argum
day, April
after the
assigned for that da

Per Mr. Chi

B. F. Looney, Attorney
General, and Luther
Nickels, Assistant Attor-
ney General, of the State
of Texas,
756 vs. Appellants,
Eastern Texas Railroad
Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday April 15th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Rigney & Company,
807 vs. Petitioner,
Aunt Jemima Mills Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

811	D. L. Weatherby, Administrator of Albert Williams deceased, Petitioner vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

812.	Edward Stoecker, as Trustee of the Estate of H. J. Patterson, a Bankrupt, Petitioner vs. Marian A. Patterson and H. J. Patterson	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: The United | On motion for leave to
tates, | file an information
ink. Petitioner. | for contempt.

Per curiam:

Although of opinion that the suggestions filed
y the defendant Judge in answer to the motion for
eave to file an information for contempt are inade-
quate to sustain his failure to impose and give effect
o the sentence, as required by our mandate, we never-
theless deem it unnecessary now to pass upon the
pplication for leave to file the information for
the following reasons:

1. Because the suggestions presented by the Judge
ave no room for controversy that his action, although
ithout the limits of his discretion, was yet based
pon a mistaken assumption to the contrary.

2. Because we are sure that pointing out such
ndate will lead to a complete and prompt com-
liance with our former mandate and render
urther action upon the motion unnecessary.

It is, therefore, ordered that the consideration
f the motion be postponed until Monday, March
th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

539 John Russell and
George Russell,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States.

The motion
in this cau
mitted to c
tion of the C
the Second a

arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davi
of the same, and Mr. R. O. Brown in opp
thereto.

694 Robert F. Stroud,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to
Court of the
for the Dist

This cause came on to be heard on the t
of the record from the District Court of t
States for the District of Kansas, and M
General Davis, of counsel for the defendant
having filed a confession of error and m
Court to reverse the judgment herein, It
in pursuance of which confession and motio
here ordered and adjudged by this Court
judgment of the said District Court in t
and the same is hereby reversed; and tha
be, and the same is hereby remanded to th
trict Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justi

752 Louis H. Perlman,
Appellant, and
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

The motion
in this cause
mitted to c

the record and a printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file brief in opposition thereto within two weeks.

Glasgow Navigation
Co., Ltd.,
419 vs. Appellant
Munson Steamship Line

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John W. Griffin in support of the same, and Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Charles R. Hickox and Mr. Peter Keating in opposition thereto.

John L. Crocking
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
J. T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Delos G. Haynes, Mr. Robert S. Blair and Mr. Paul A. Blair in support of the same.

Macbeth-Evans Glass Co.
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
General Electric Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Synnestvedt and Mr. Joseph Wilby in support of the same, and leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto within three days.

Monday, February 4th, 1918, contin

808 Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., The petition f
vs. Petitioner, of certiorari i
Houston Ice & Brewing Co., was submitte
et al. consideration
by Mr. Rosent
in support of the same.

831 Erie Railroad Co., The petition f
vs. Petitioner, of certiorari h
John R. Stuart et al. was submitted
consideration
Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thom
in support of the same, and Mr. Reeves T.
in opposition thereto.

154 Utica State Bank, On motion of M
et al., Joseph W. Bailey
vs. Petitioners, counsel for the
Houston Pasture Co., in, leave is here
granted to file
additional brief for the respondent herein on or be
Wednesday next.

423. Southern Bell Tele- In Error to the
phone & Telegraph Co., Court of the S
vs. Plaintiff in Error, North Carolin
W. E. Hollifield.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of co
for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of e
this cause has been filed, Bu

said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Monday, March 11th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope, it is ordered that Arthur H. Ewald, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that W. B. Hamilton, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E.

Dunn, Esquire, of Moundsville, State of West
Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
y Mr. Edward H. Syme, it is ordered that Alfred
. Stricklett, Esquire of Covington, State of Kentucky,
admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-
llor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. William W. Hastings, it is ordered that
imms C. Davis, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of
klahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney
d counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac-
rdingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. H. M. Havner, it is ordered that Louis Howard
alinger, Esquire, of Carroll, State of Iowa, be ad-
itted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of
s Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, it is ordered that
ards Giglietti, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illi-
be admitted to practice as an attorney and
nsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. John H. Zabel, it is ordered that
Rogers, Esquire, of Washington, District
be admitted to practice as an attorney a
of this Court, and he was sworn accordi

On motion first made to the Court in
by Mr. Robert S. Johnstone, it is ordered
J. Goldstein, Esquire, of New York City,
Correct Spelling – "Anderson" 4/28/58
Anderson, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State
be admitted to practice as attorneys and co
this Court, and they were sworn according

On motion first made to the Court in
Mr. Hannis Taylor, it is ordered that
Adams, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of N
be admitted to practice as an attorney an
of this Court, and he was sworn according

On motion first made to the Court in the
Mr. W. L. F. Fierson, it is ordered that Cha
Coffey, Esquire, of Washington, District of
be admitted to practice as an attorney and
of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in the
Mr. William C. Pawley, it is ordered that
Thatcher, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of
be admitted to practice as an attorney a
of this Court, and he was sworn accordin

On motion first made to the Cou

by Mr. P. Garland Dupre, it is ordered that William J. Waguespack, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nicholas Conrad Davis it is ordered that T. B. Cosgrove, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California; Joseph Cook Ogden, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana; Raymond E. Dawson, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey; Franklin Leonidas Maier, Esquire, of Massillon, State of Ohio, and J. F. Randolph, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Order [illegible]

7 On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Clapp, it is ordered that James Richardson, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

X On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo V. Morgan, it is ordered that John C. Burke, Esquire, of (Newport) ~~[illegible]~~, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Clarence M.

be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Hannah L. Andrews,
Executrix of the Will of
Benajah P. Andrews,
deceased,

In Error to the Court of
Errors and Appeals of
the State of New Jersey.

140 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Nix & Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Hannah L. Andrews,
Executrix of the Will of
Benajah P. Andrews,
deceased,

In Error to the Court of
Errors and Appeals of
the State of New Jersey.

141 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph D. Hendrickson.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged

Error and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

580 Great Northern Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. C. Alexander, Administrator of the Estate of John F. Hill, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

583 Northern Pacific Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Emma A. Wismer, substituted for George F. Wismer, deceased.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

88
George W. Egan,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles S. McDonald.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

98
Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al.
Appellants,
vs.
The United States.
Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

per Mr Justice Brandeis.

(Mr Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

185 John H. Evans, Trustee, Appellant, vs. The City of Akron. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr Justice Day and Mr Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

207 Philip Nelson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Southern Railway Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

160 Nicholas V. Bilby and H. B. Moffitt, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Albert Stewart, Lucy Stewart, Willie Cornell, Ben Reed, Sampson Buck, and Jackson Stewart. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

171 John P. Brogan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The National Surety Co. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Michigan; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting;
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice Pitney
Mr Justice McReynolds.

118

Emma J. McCurdy, County Treasurer of Osage County, Oklahoma, and The City of Pawhuska, Appellants, vs. The United States of America	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

per Mr Justice Brandeis

Louis H. Dumas,
147 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Ridpath Anthony,
Executrix of W. M. Ridpath
deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr Justice McReynolds

H. J. Gunning and
Ellen E. Gunning, his wife,
440 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Peter Morrison and Agnes
Morrison, his wife.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior,
Cato Sells, Commissioner
of Indian Affairs; and
John Burke, Treasurer of
the United States,
Appellants,

169 vs.

John G. Morrison, Jr., for
and on behalf of himself and
all other members of the Chippewa Tribe
of Indians in Minnesota
similarly situated.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to affirm the decree of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

575 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward Bathgate, Martin Peacock, John Foster et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

576 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John J. Buchhannon, Philip Brehler, H. Boesky et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

577 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Henry Brown, John Otto, Joseph McCabe et al. | In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

578 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Farrell, Peter M. Long, John Long et al. | In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

579

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Oscar Krayer, Charles Hamburger, Joseph Emery, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

580

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Robert Nicolai, John Ryan, Frank Rouse, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Arkansas,
4 Original vs. Complainant;
The State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings and proofs, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered that the questions submitted for the determination of the Court be answered as follows:

(1) The true boundary line between the States, aside from the question of the avulsion of 1876, is the middle of the main channel of navigation of the Mississippi River as it existed at the Treaty of Peace concluded between the United States and Great Britain in 1783, subject to such changes as have occurred since that time through natural and gradual processes.

(2) By the avulsion of 1876 the boundary line between the States was unaffected, and remained in the middle of the former main channel of navigation, as above defined.

(3) The boundary line should now be located according to the middle of that channel as it was at the time the current ceased to flow therein as a result of the avulsion of 1876.

(4) A commission consisting of three competent persons, to be named by the court upon the suggestion of counsel, will be appointed to run, locate, and designate the boundary line between the States at the place in question in accordance with the above principles.

(5.) The nature and extent of the erosions and ac-

to its abandonment by the consent as a result
avulsion of 1876, and the question whether
ticable now to locate accurately the line of
as it then ran, will be referred to said com
subject to a review of its decision by this cou
be.

The parties may submit the form of an
tory decree to carry into effect the above con

per Mr Justice D

City and County of Denver
et al.,
291 vs. Appellants,
The Denver Union Water Co.
The Denver Union Water Co.
295 vs. Appellant,
City and County of Denver
et al.

Appeals f
District C
the United
for the D
Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran
the record from the District Court of the Un
States for the District of Colorado, the appeal
cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. O
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered, a
and decreed by this Court that the decree
said District Court in this cause be, and the
is hereby, modified so as to overrule, instead o
out, the exceptions taken by the defendants to
ter's report, and, as so modified, be, and the same
affirmed, the costs in this Court to be paid by
City and County of Denver

No. 294.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Dissenting,
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Albert E. Sutton, Rachel E. Keatley, Delano H. Sutton et al. 134 vs. Appellants, John H. & L. English et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Ex parte: In the matter of Frank M. Slater, Public Administrator of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, as such in charge of the Estate of David T. Bowman, deceased. 27 Original. Petitioner.	On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus, the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here

discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

733 International Paper Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Judicial Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

734 The Locomobile Company of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here

udged by this Court that the judgment of the said
upreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the
ame is hereby reversed with costs; and that this
ause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the
aid Supreme Judicial Court for further proceedings
ot inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr Justice Van Devanter.

heney Brothers Co., Lans
n Monotype Machine
, Locomobile Company
f America et al.
vs Plaintiffs in Error,
e Commonwealth of Mass-
husetts.

In Error to the Supreme
Judicial Court of
the State of Massa-
chusetts.

his cause came on to be heard on the transcript of
e record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the
ate of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.
e consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and
judged by this Court that the judgment of the
d Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the
me is hereby reversed with costs as to Cheney Brothers
mpany and affirmed with costs as to the other
aintiffs in error; and that this cause be, and the
me is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Judi-
l Court for further proceedings not inconsistent
h the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr Justice Van Devanter.

56. Municipal Securities Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Kansas City.

In Error to
Court of the
Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the
the record from the Supreme Court of the
Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On
tion whereof, It is now here ordered and
by this Court that the writ of error in this
the same is hereby, dismissed for the want
tion.

Per Mr Justice

111 Emma T. Krueger,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the
States Circuit Cou
Appeals for the
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
record from the United States Circuit Court of
for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by co
consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, an
and decreed by this Court that the decree of th
United States Circuit Court of Appeals in th
be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and th
cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to
trict Court of the United States for the District
rado.

Per Mr Justice Day

(Mr Justice McReynolds took no part in the co
tion or decision of this cause.)

124 Peoples Tobacco Co., Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. American Tobacco Co. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice ~~Pitney~~ Day.

X (Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

126 J. H. Brader, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Rachel James, formerly Rachel Reed. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

143 Emil Eiger, Oscar L. Eiger, and Joseph Eiger, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Peter Garrity. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

157 H. B. Talley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Daniel S. Burgess and J. L. Harvey. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Day.

Willeam J. Anicker, v. Appellant, rtha M. Gunsburg, Ralph rdeilitter, and Walter P. ross, Administrators and ble Personal Representatives f David Gunsburg, deceased nd Southwestern Petroleum Co.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

his cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the
ecord from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals
r the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On
onsideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged,
nd decreed by this Court that the decree of the said
nited States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause
e, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and
hat this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to
he District Court of the United States for the Eastern
District of Oklahoma.

per Mr. Justice Day

eat Northern Rail ay Co., v. Plaintiff in Error idora Donaldson, as Ad- ministratrix of the Estate of ames H. Brown, deceased	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of
e record from the Supreme Court of the State of

tion whereof. It is now here ordered and adju
the Court that the judgment of the said
Court in this cause be, and the same is here
with costs and interest until paid at the
per annum that similar judgments bear in
of the State of Washington.

per Mr Justice D

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co.,
158 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Texas

In Error to the
Court of Civil Appeals,
Supreme Judicial
trict, State of

This cause came on to be heard on the tran
the record from the Court of Civil Appeals,
Supreme Judicial District of the State of
and was argued by counsel. On consideration
of It is now here ordered and adjudged by
Court that the judgment of the said Court
Appeals in this cause be, and the same is he
firmed with costs.

per Mr Justice Holm

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice McReynolds

127. Armour & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia. | In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

363. Boston Store of Chicago, vs. American Graphophone Co. and Columbia Graphophone Co. | On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative, and the second, third and [illegible] fourth in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Concurring:

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., Petitioner, vs. International Curtis Marine Turbine Co. and Curtis Marine Turbine Co. of The United States. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

793

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause to the extent that it directed the accounting to be made on the basis therein stated be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

n Wireless Telegraph
merica
Petitioner,
f Simon

On writ of certiorari to
the United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for the
Second Circuit

ause came on to be heard on the transcript of
rd from the United States Circuit Court of
for the Second Circuit, and was argued by coun-
onsideration whereof, It is now here ordered, ad-
nd decreed by this Court that the decree of the
ited States Circuit Court of Appeals and the de-
he District Court of the United States for the South-
trict of New York in this cause be, and the same
y reversed with costs; and that this cause be,
ame is hereby remanded to the said District
further proceedings in conformity with the opin-
s Court,

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

ting:
Justice McKenna

und Traction
Power Co. The Seattle
ht. Boston Safe De-
Trust Co. et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
mund D. Hamm and
od, as Commissioners of
District No. 1, King County,

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Washing-
ton.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the S
of Washington and was argued by counsel. On c
ation whereof, It is now here ordered and adj
by this Court that the writ of error in this cause
the same is hereby dismissed for the want of ju
tion.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

John Knewell and George
Knewell,
538. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

In Error to the U
States Circuit Co
Appeals for the T
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
record from the United States Circuit Court of
for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss
was argued by counsel. On consideration whereo
now here ordered and adjudged by this Court t
writ of error in this cause be, and the same is he
missed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice W

Steamship Bowdoin Co.,
476. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Industrial Accident Com-
mission of the State of
California et al.

In Error to the
preme Court o
State of Califor

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
record from the Supreme Court of the State of C
and was argued by counsel. On c

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

174 Alaska Pacific Steamship Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

475

Alaska Pacific Steamship Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

In Error to the
Court of the
California.

This cause came on to be heard on the trans
record from the Supreme Court of the State of
and was argued by counsel. On consideration
It is now here ordered and adjudged by this C
the judgment of the said Supreme Court in t
be, and the same is hereby reversed with cos
that this cause be, and the same is hereby re
to the said Supreme Court for further proceedi

Per Mr. Chief Justice

179

Ford Motor Co.,
vs. Appellant,
John S. Chambers, as Controller of the State of California.

Appeal from the
trict Court of the
States for the N
District of Califo

This cause came on to be heard on the transcr
record from the District Court of the United
the Northern District of California, and was
by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is n
ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court
decree of the said District Court in this cause
the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Ch

[illegible] Navigation Co., Limited,
[illegible] vs. Appellant,
Munson Steamship Line.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis H. [illegible],
Appellant and
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co.,
728 vs. Petitioner,
Houston Ice & Brewing Co. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

881 Erie Railroad Co.
vs. Petitioner,
John R. Shuart et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

821 Macbeth-Evans Glass Co.
vs. Petitioner,
General Electric Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

843 John L. Creveling,
vs. Petitioner,
J. T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia ment of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Michael Quinn,
24 Original. Petitioner.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, It is ordered by the Court that the return to the rule in this cause be, and the same is hereby filed

The United States of America
614 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Federal Publishing Co.
The United States of America
615 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Butterick Co.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the Court a motion to advance these cases.

Hugo Yangua,
767 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.
Otto Yangua,
768 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America

The motion to dismiss or affirm in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendants in error.

781 Gulf Oil Corporation,
vs. Petitioner,
C. G. Lewellyn, Collector, etc.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

823 Jacob Rouss,
vs. Petitioner,
The Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Emile Bonkin, in support of the same, and Mr. George W. Wickersham and Mr. Einar Chrystie in opposition thereto.

799 George F. Montgomery,
vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

Mr. Robert L. Johnstone, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

832 Alfred T. Putnam,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. A. Ayers in support of the same and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

10 Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner, vs. John Mitchell, individually, et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Hogg of counsel for the respondents, It is ordered by the Court that the return to the rule to show cause herein be, and the same is hereby, filed.

595 [illegible]-Nashville Lumber Co. et al., Petitioners vs. Alvin D. Goldman, Trustee

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. S. Priest, Mr. Morton Jourdan and Mr. T. E. Francis in support of the same and Mr. W. E. Hemingway, Mr. C. B. Rose, Mr. J. F. Loughborough and Mr. V. M. Miles in opposition thereto.

A 805 Frank A. Bone, Petitioner, vs. Commissioners of Marion County

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope in support of the same, and Mr. W. H. Lockwood in opposition thereto.

806 The Michigan Central Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the Court in principal argument by Mr. J. Walter Doheny and Mr. Frank E. Robson in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd in opposition thereto.

282 Grant N. Jefferson et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
William J. Cook et al., as
Administrators, etc.

Mr. W. W. Hastings, in behalf of counsel, suggested the death of William J. Cook and Albert J. English, Administrators of the Estate of F. B. Severs, deceased, two of the defendants in error in this cause, and moved the Court to make D. N. Fink and Ed. Hurd, Administrators of the Estate of the said F. B. Severs, deceased, parties defendants in error herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said D. N. Fink and Ed. Hurd, Administrators of the Estate of F. B. Severs, deceased, be, and they are hereby made parties defendants in error in this cause in place of the said William J. Cook and Albert J. English, deceased.

283 The Yazoo & Mississippi
Valley Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. G. McNeill

Mr. H. Garland Dupré, in behalf of counsel, suggested the death of W. G. McNeill, the defendant in error in this cause, and moved the Court to make D. A. McNeill as Administrator of the Estate of the said W. G. McNeill, deceased, herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said D. A. McNeill, as Administrator of the Estate of W. G. McNeill, deceased, be, and he is hereby made the party defendant in error in this cause.

779, 807 Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Territory of Alaska. The motion to dismiss in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr George B. Grigsby in support of the same and Mr. Harvey M. Friend in opposition thereto.

442 Alaska Salmon Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Territory of Alaska. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr George B. Grigsby in support of the same.

837 Anna Maria Berg et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles D. Baker. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hatton Summers in support of the same.

802 Mattie Hogan, Petitioner, vs. Robert Abrams. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consid.

Mr. Dallas V. Halverstadt in support of the same.

896

Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, Petitioner,
vs.
Kingdom of Roumania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jo. V. Morgan and Mr. Frank M. Patterson in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield in opposition thereto.

846

Erie Railroad Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Edward J. Hilt, Jr., an infant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George S. Hobart in support of the same, and Mr. James J. Murphy in opposition thereto.

848

Albert G. Dickinson, Petitioner,
vs.
The O. & W. Thum Co.

849

The A. K. Ackerman Co., Petitioner,
vs.
The O. & W. Thum Co.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Roger W. Butterfield and Mr. Willard F. Keeney in support of the same, and Mr. Fred L. Chappell in opposition thereto.

657
Edward B. Pryor et al.,
as Receivers, etc.,
vs. Petitioners,
Albyn Williams

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Minnis in support of the same.

858
McClintic-Marshall
Construction Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Elnora Fogy

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. M. Langworthy, Mr. O. H. Dean and Mr. W. D. McLeod in support of the same, and Mr. Daniel V. Howell in opposition thereto.

874
Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
Ollie S. Kimmer, Admini-
stratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher, Mr. Charles N. Wheeler, Mr. Edmund F. Trabue and Mr. Blewett Lee in support of the same.

880
Edmund Jefferson Bryan
vs. [illegible] Exr.,
Louisville & Nashville Rail-
road Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed ar-

Jewett in support of the same, and Mr. Shepard Barclay in opposition thereto.

810 Edward Jefferson Bryan,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Shepard Barclay, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in support of the same.

722 Louis H. Orr,
vs. Appellant,
Henry M. Allen et al.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

232 H. A. Moore and J. F. Bradford,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
C. C. Moore et al.

Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the defendants in error, suggested the death of Peter Martin, one of the defendants in error in this cause, and moved the Court to make the Union Trust Company of San Francisco, Administrator with the will annexed of Peter Martin, deceased, a party defendant in error herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Union Trust Company of San Francisco, Administrator with the will annexed of Peter Martin, deceased, be, and it is hereby, made a party defendant in

denied.

H. A. Moore and J. F. Bradford,
332 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
C. C. Moore et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. Evans Browne, Mr. William F. Herrin and Mr. E. S. Pillsbury in support of the same.

Southern Pacific Co.,
453 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Z. Lowe, Jr., U. S. Collector, etc.

On motion of Mr. R. R. Reed in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

Jacob M. Dickinson, as Receiver, etc.,
785 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George C. Stiles

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George H. Lamar in support of the same, and Mr. McNeil V. Seymour in opposition thereto.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.,
838 Petitioner,
vs.
L. J. Ray, Administratrix, &c.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by

Mr. R. J. Roberts and Mr. M. L. Bell in
the same.

867	Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America	The petition f of certiorari being submitte consideration Court by Mr. C. Noyes in sup

X the same, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr.
Attorney General Warren in opposition thereto.

850	Capital Savings Bank & Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Inhabitants of the Town of Framingham	The petition f of certiorari submitted to t sideration of the C presented argume Mr. Samuel E.

Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., in support of th
and Mr. Alfred Hemenway and Mr. Edw
Abbott, Jr. in opposition thereto.

11	Hitchman Coal & Coke Co., Petitioner, vs. John Mitchell, individually, et al.	Mr. Martin of argument for Kachinsky, sub to the consider the Court is

dismiss the contempt proceedings as to said d
Kachinsky.

— Original. State of Iowa, Complainant, vs. Abraham Slimmer, Jr., et al.

Mr. H. M. Havner, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

739. E. H. Emery & Co., Appellant, vs. American Refrigerator Transit Co.

Mr. H. M. Havner, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause under the thirty-second rule.

— Original. Ex parte: In the matter of William H. Blymyer, Petitioner.

Mr. William H. Blymyer submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

— Original. State of Nevada, Complainant, vs. Crown Willamette Paper Co.

Mr. George B. Thatcher, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein.

–Y. Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Michael Liram, Petitioner.

On motion of Mr. William C. Prentiss of counsel for the petitioner

Court that same be, and the same is here
to file policies herein on or before Monda

413. Interboro Brewing Co. Inc., On writ of ce
vs. Petitioner. the United
The Standard Brewing Co. cuit Court
of Baltimore City. for the Fourth

It appearing to the Court that a motio
for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of cer
this cause has been filed. Therefore, on pe
said motion, it is now here ordered, adjud
creed by this Court that the writ of certi
this cause be, and the same is hereby dis
costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justi

331 David Goldsmith et al. In Error to
vs. Plaintiffs in Error. Court of Ap
Alfred C. F. Meyer State of Ma

It appearing to the Court that a stipula
counsel for the respective parties to dismis
of error in this cause has been filed. Therefo
suance of said stipulation, it is now here
adjudged by this Court that the writ of er
cause be, and the same is hereby dismis

Per Mr. Chief Justic

631 David Goldsmith et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Alfred C. F. Meyer.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

325 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Thomas Soldana et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant-Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.

323 S. A. Hays Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
vs. Petitioner.
The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.

334 The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co.,
vs.
Joseph J. Scott, as Collector of U.S. Internal Revenue, &c.

It is ordered by the Court that eight and three-quarters hours be allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the Collectors and The United States

E. J. Lynch, Collector of
Internal Revenue, etc.,
421 vs. Petitioner,
Henry Turrish.

E. J. Lynch, Collector of
Internal Revenue, etc.,
422 vs. Petitioner,
H. C. Hornby.

Emmanuel J. Doyle,
Collector of Internal Revenue,
492 vs. Petitioner
Mitchell Brothers Co.

The United States of America
593 vs. Petitioner,
The Cleveland, Cincinnati,
Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.

The United States of America,
594 vs. Petitioner,
Biwabik Mining Co.

Southern Pacific Co.
453 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Z. Lowe, Jr., U. S. Collector
of Internal Revenue, etc.

Charles A. Peabody,
765 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mark Eisner, Collector, etc.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until
tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

rsuant to adjournment, the Court met today
t the Capitol.

Present:
he Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

roclamation being made, the Court is opened.

n motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that
ward R. Canfie, Esquire, of Columbus, State of
o; John Marks, Esquire, of Napoleonville, State
Louisiana, and Nat E. Tigon, Esquire, of
, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice
ttorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they
e sworn accordingly.

motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Mr. Stanley W. Johnson, it is ordered that Lella
Campbell and Romphre B. Campbell, Esquire,
os Angeles, State of California, be admitted to

and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Thompson, it is ordered that Charles T. Grundy, Esquire, of Atchison, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rainey it is ordered that William J. Cundiff, Esquire, of Danville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that Joseph S. Rosalsky, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burgess W. Marshall, it is ordered that Louis R. Glavis, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan B. Williams, it is ordered that Thomas McCusker, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Goldfield Consolidated
Mines Co.
vs.
Joseph J. Scott, as Collector, &c.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to file the brief of counsel for The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Company when said brief is received.

A. Hays, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner.
The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.
The Goldfield Consolidated
Mines Co.
vs.
oseph J. Scott, as Collector, &c.
J. Lynch, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner.
ry Turrish.
J. Lynch, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner.
C. Hornby.
nuel J. Doyle, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner.
Mitchell Brothers Co.
e United States of America
vs. Petitioner.
he Cleveland, Cincinnati,
hicago & St. Louis Railway Co.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the Collectors and The United States; Mr. Gordon M. Buck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error in case No. 452; Mr. Henry W. Clark, of counsel for the plaintiff in error in case No. 705, and Mr. A. W. Clapp, of counsel for the respondents in cases Nos. 421 and 422.

The United States of America,
594 vs. Petitioner,
Biwabik Mining Co.,

Southern Pacific Co.,
452 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Z. Lowe, Jr., United
States Collector, &c.

Charles A. Peabody,
705 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mark Eisner, Collector &c.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 6th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham, it is ordered that Archer E. Patterson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rainey, it is ordered that Eugene L. ney and Paul Lamoreaux, Esquires, of Chicago, tate of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys nd counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn ccordingly.

Wednesday, March 6th, 1918, contin

874 Illinois Central Railroad Co.,
vs. Petitioner,
William Kenney, Administrator, &c.

Op...ment
Daniel
on that
Court is

granted to file a brief for the respondent in

327 S. A. Hays, Collector, &c.,
vs. Petitioner,
The Gauley Mountain Coal Co.

334 The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co.
vs.
Joseph J. Scott, as Collector, &c.

421 E. J. Lynch, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner,
Henry Turrish

422 E. J. Lynch, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner,
H. C. Hornby

492 Emanuel J. Doyle, Collector, &c.
vs. Petitioner,
Mitchell Brothers Co.

593 The United States of America,
vs. Petitioner,
The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.

594 The United States of America,
vs. Petitioner,
Bumble Mining Co.

The argume
these cases
tinued by M
Clapp, of cou
the responden
case No. 42
Mr. George W
of counsel for
respondent in
593, Mr. Ma
rie, of counsel
respondent in
492, and conc
Mr. C. C. Dunt
counsel for the
ent in case No
Case No. 327
mitted on a f
argument by
Henry R. Ch
counsel for the
and then No.
submitted on
argument by

452 Southern Pacific Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, John Z. Lowe, Jr., United States Collector, &c.
703 Charles A. Peabody, vs. Plaintiff in Error Mark Eisner, Collector, &c.

for The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co.

468 The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error. Joseph L. Snider

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Joseph S. Rosalsky, of counsel for the defendant in error.

611 John D. Ireland, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. George W. Wickersham, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Robert S. Johnstone, of counsel for the defendant in error.

457 H. A. A. Smith, Auditor, &c., vs. Plaintiff in Error. William H. Jackson.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. B. F. Harrah, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, March 7th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
} Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener, it is ordered that Theodore D. Halpin, Esquire, of Lapeer, State of Michigan, and William E. Russell, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

457 H. A. A. Smith, Auditor &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. William H. Jackson

The argument of this cause was continued, by Mr. B. F. Harrah of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey of counsel for the defendant in error.

567 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Fred. W. Weitzel

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. E. Leichlett, of counsel for the defendant in error.

174 Union Pacific Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles M. Hadley, as Administrator, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Nelson H. Loomis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John J. Halligan, of counsel for the defendant in error.

371 The Toledo Newspaper Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, March 8th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that George W. Pancoast, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that Samuel A. Glück, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. Whelan, it is ordered that Dexter T. [illegible], Esquire, of [illegible]

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, it is ordered that Edward V. Conwell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Brown Scott, it is ordered that Jasper Yeates Brinton, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that John Stone Hawkins, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses P. Kinkaid, it is ordered that J. V. Golden, Esquire, of O'Neill, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Emil N. Zolla, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman it is ordered that N. Sidney Goldstein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter Goelet Gerry, it is ordered that Peter H. McKiernan and James M. Byrne, Esquires, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

371 The Toledo Newspaper Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. William L. Day and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

29 The Salt Lake Investment Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. H. King of counsel for and Mr. Harvey W. Clark, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, March 11th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Fitts, it is ordered that Arthur J. [illegible], Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and [illegible] Anderson Lord, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred. H. Dominick, it is ordered that Eugene S. Blease, Esquire, of Newberry, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court. And he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander [illegible], it is ordered that Robert M. Searls, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Mecartney, it is ordered that Francis W. Walker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Armanis F. Knotts, Esquire, of Gary, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Halvor Steenerson, it is ordered that Alva A. Andrews, Esquire, of Bemidji, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Crawford, it is ordered that Eugene Hubbard, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. [illegible], it is ordered that Mark H. [illegible], Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Knowland, it is ordered that Harry A. L. [illegible], Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Laurence A. Jenny, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

268. Henry A. Detjen,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Central Leather Company.
In Error to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

269. Henry A. Detjen,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Central Leather Company.
In Error to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

119.	Edwardo Ricaud, L. N. Barlow and Charles Nickerson vs. The American Metal Company, Limited.	On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first and third questions must be answered in the affirmative, and the second question in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

90.	W. A. Cissna, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Tennessee.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

No. Orig.
State of Iowa,
vs. Complainant,
Abraham Slimmer, Jr.,
Charles Bechhofer, Adolph
Lipman and the State of
Minnesota.

On motion for leave to
file bill of complaint.

Consideration of the application for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause is postponed to Monday, the fifteenth day of April, on which date leave is granted the parties to be heard orally concerning the same, the complainant in the meanwhile to give to these named defendants notice of the application and of this order, and in addition the Clerk is directed to transmit to the Governor of Minnesota a copy of this order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

767.
Hugo Gunyer,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court
of the United States for the
District of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

* * *

Otto [illegible],
No. 8. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United States
for the District of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

* * *

State of Nevada,
— Orig. vs. Complainant,
Crown Willamette Paper Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendant, returnable on the first day of the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

614. The United States of America, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Federal Publishing Company.

615. The United States of America vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Butterick Company.

On conside
the motion
cases he
It is now
ordered
Court th
motion
the same

granted, and the cases assigned for argument on
October 8th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

781. Gulf Oil Corporation vs. Petitioner, C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of
to advance this cau
now here ordered b
Court that said m
and the same is h
granted, and the c
signed for argumen

Tuesday, October 8th next, after the cases heretofore
for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

722. Louis N. Orr, vs. Appellant, Henry M. Allen, Edward A. Deeds, Gordon Rentschler, as The Board of Directors of the Miami Conservancy District.

On consideration of
to advance this ca
now here ordered
Court that said m
and the same is
granted, and the
assigned for arg

Tuesday, October 8th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

738. Jacob M. Dickinson, as Receiver of The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George C. Stiles.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

739. C. H. Emery & Company, Appellant,
vs.
American Refrigerator Transit Company.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

749. George F. Montgomery, Appellant,
vs.
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

330. N. L. Moss and J. F. Bradford, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
C. C. Moore et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

846.	Erie Railroad Company, vs. Petitioner, Edwin J. Hilt, Jr., an infant, by his next friend, and Edwin J. Hilt, Sr.	On petition Certiorari States Cir of Appeal Third Cou

On consideration of the petition for a writ of
herein to the United States Circuit Court of App
Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel the
as well in support of as against the same, it is no
by this Court that the said petition be, and the sa
granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

851.	Edward B. Pryor and Edward F. Kearney, as Receivers of The Wabash Railroad Company, vs. Petitioners, Allega Williams.	On petition f Certiorari to Supreme Co State of Mi

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certi
to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of
ment of Counsel in support of the same, it is now he
by this Court that the said petition be, and the s
hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank A. Brown,
832. vs. Petitioner,
Commissioners of Marion County.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jacob Rouss,
833. vs. Petitioner,
The Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alfred T. Peterson,
834. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari

herein to the United States Circuit Court of Ap
the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of coun
had, as well in support of as against the same,
here ordered by this Court that the said petition b
same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anne Marie Berg et al., On petition for writ
837. vs. Petitioners, Certiorari to the Supre
Charles O. Baker. of the State of Mi

On consideration of the petition for a writ of ce
herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minneso
of the argument of counsel in support of the same, i
here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,
same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mattie Rieger, On petition for writ of cert
842. vs. Petitioner, the Supreme Court of the
Robert Abrams. Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of ce
herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, a
argument of counsel [illegible] in support
~~against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Cour
said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] [illegible] Savings Bank & Trust Company. vs. Petitioner, Inhabitants of the Town of Framingham. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

834. The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. L. J. Ray, Administratrix of the estate of H. E. Ray, deceased. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

835. McClintic-Marshall Construction Company, Petitioner, vs. Almora Fogg. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiora
the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eig
and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well i
as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court
petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt
Actien Gesellschaft, otherwise known
as The Hamburg-American Steam
Packet Company and as Hamburg-
American Line, et al.,
867. vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

On petition
of certiorari
United St
Court of A
for the S
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certio
to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,
in support of as against the same, it is now here or
this Court that the said petition be, and the same is h
denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad
Company,
974. vs. Petitioner,
Allie Skinner, Administratrix
of Lloyd B. Skinner, deceased.

On petition for writ
certiorari to the Cour
Appeals of the
Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of ce herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	The Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
896.		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. Kingdom of Roumania.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
876.		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

898. Grayson - Nashville
Lumber Company and
Nashville Lumber Company,
vs. Petitioners,
Alvin D. Goldman,
Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

463. The United States of America
and Mrs. Josephine Brown,
vs. Appellants,
New Orleans Pacific Railway
Company et al.

---

464. The United States of America
and William R. Turner,
vs. Appellants,
New Orleans Pacific Railway
Company et al.

---

465. The United States of America
and Stephen N. Grant,
vs. Appellants,
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company et al.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
vs. Appellant,
The United States of America.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edward M. [illegible] and
Charles [illegible] Byron.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Judson Harmon et al. Receivers etc.,
vs. Petitioners,
Lucinda Barber, Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Morison R. Waite and Mr. John Randolph Schindel, in support of the same, and by Mr. C. B. Matthews, in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Holland, Administrator etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago &
St. Louis Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. William W. Crawford, Mr. Edmund F. Trabue and Mr. John C. Doolan, of counsel for defendant in error, in support of the same.

879. H. P. Mitcham, vs. Petitioner, Mrs. Virginia A. Thompson.

The petition for a writ
herein to the United S
Court of Appeals for the
Circuit was submitted
consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr.
H. Moise in behalf of Mr. Arthur J. Powell and Mr.
Milton, for petitioner, and by Mr. George E. [illegible]
in opposition thereto.

320. Illinois Central Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mrs. Marshall Lewis, Administratrix etc.

The motion to di
appeal in this cau
submitted to the
of the Court, on th
and printed arg
by Mr. H. [illegible]
in behalf of Mr. Forrest Farrar, for the defendant i
support of the motion, and by Mr. Gustave Lewis, M
C. Lewis, Mr. Blewett Lee and Mr. R. V. Fletcher, for
in error, in opposition thereto.

180. Watts, Watts & Company, Limited, vs. Petitioner, Unione Austriaca di Navigazione, etc.

The motion t
case to the
submitted to t
tion of the Cou
printed argum
Mr. Charles Henry Butler, in behalf of Mr. J. Parker Kirlin
M. Woolsey and Mr. Clarke [illegible], for the petitioner, in suppor
motion, and by Mr. L. [illegible] [illegible] and Mr. [illegible]
A. Knight for the respondent, in opposition thereto.

833. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
Mater
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Missouri ex rel.
James P. Newell.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston in behalf of Mr. George F. Haid and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Elliott W. Major, Mr. Charles D. [illegible], Mr. Selden P. Spencer and Mr. George B. Webster for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

877. Craig Mountain Lumber Company, Limited,
vs. Petitioner,
James Tuohy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. [illegible] and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.

879. John [illegible] New,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg in behalf of Mr. R. E. Ragland, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, for the respondent.

[illegible] The [illegible] Company,
vs. Petitioner,
The [illegible] Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Banner, for the petitioner.

Armanis F. Knotts,
888. vs. Petitioner,
Clark Construction Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. J. Whaning, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph W. Moses, Mr. Hamilton Moses and Mr. Walter Bachrach, for respondent.

J. F. Shepard et al.
257. vs. Appellants,
James M. Barkley, Moderator of the General Assembly &c. et al.

The motion to amend petition for and order granting appeal and citation thereon, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James T. Kaye, in behalf of Mr. Charles E. Morrow, for the appellants, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frank Hagerman, for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Upper Hudson Stone Company,
889. vs. Petitioner,
Joseph Leslie White et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Crowther, in behalf of Mr. Thomas [illegible], for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark Ash, for the respondents.

Monday, March 11th, 1918, Continued.

909. K. B. Burns et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Horace L. Payne et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton, in behalf of Mr. Nathan A. Gibson and Mr. Joseph L. Hull, for the petitioners, and by Mr. George S. Ramsey, Mr. Edgar A. de Meules, Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser, Mr. Villard Martin and Mr. J. Berry King, for the respondents.

910. West End Street Railway Company,
vs. Petitioner,
John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne, for the petitioner.

911. Ed Spear,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Levi Cooke, in behalf of Mr. S. W. Fordyce, Junior, and Mr. Truman Post Young, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, for the respondent.

883. Tatum Brothers Real Estate & Investment Company, Petitioner, vs. W. E. Shank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick de Cancy Faust, in behalf of Mr. William P. Smith and Mr. [illegible] W. Acheson, for the petitioner, and by Mr. [illegible] M. [illegible], for the respondent.

27 Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Frank M. Slater, Petitioner.

Mr. Jacob [illegible], of counsel for the respondent herein, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to withdraw certain original papers.

889. James Allen, Petitioner, vs. Chicago & Alton Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. George W. Ellis, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn and Mr. Edward W. Everett, for the respondent.

880. John Patarini & Mary Patarini, Petitioners, vs. Memorial Hospital Association of Monongahela City, Pennsylvania, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas A. Banning, for the petitioners.

76.	The [illegible] [illegible] Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the State Corporation Commission.	This cause was argued by Mr. J. D. Hank, Junior, for the defendant in error, and submitted on printed argument by Mr. Thomas A. Banning, for the plaintiff in error.
77.	General Railway Signal Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the State Corporation Commission.	This cause was argued by Mr. Hugh Satterlee, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. D. Hank Junior, for the defendant in error.
78.	[illegible] S. Pendleton, vs. Petitioner, Benner Line.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 12th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that Harry L. Butler, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, it is ordered that Henry J. Bigham, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that [illegible] Thompson, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. [illegible], it is ordered that B. F. Welty, Esquire, of Lima, State of Ohio, and [illegible] J. Myers, Esquire, of Celina, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Chauncey P. Fairman, Esquire, of [illegible], be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

West End Street Railway
Company,
vs. Petitioner,
John F. Malley, Collector etc.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for respondent, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in behalf of respondent within ten days.

[illegible] S. Pendleton,
vs. Petitioner,
Benner Line.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, for the petitioner, by Mr. D. Roger Englar, for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. [illegible], for the petitioner.

Tuesday, March 12th, 1918, continued.

184. Robert N. Thompson, Administrator, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William B. King, of counsel for the appellant. The Court declined to hear counsel for the appellee.

185. Great Northern Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Minnesota ~~ex rel.~~
The Village of Clara City.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Lindley, Mr. M. L. Countryman and Mr. Thomas R. Benton, for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. C. A. Fosnes, for the defendant in error.

186. United Drug Company, Petitioner and Appellant,
vs.
Theodore Rectanus Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. A. Garvey, of counsel for the petitioner and appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 13th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Edgar J. Oliver, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that Lauritz Miller, Esquire, of Mitchell, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, March 13th, 1918, continued.

204. The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Whited & Wheless, Limited, et al.

On motion of Mr. H. W. R. Ogilby in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief of Mr. Henry McAllister, Junior, for Exploration Company, Limited, as amicus curiae.

193. Pittsburgh Melting Company, vs. Appellant, J. E. Totten, Inspector of the Bureau of Animal Industry etc.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, for the appellee, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

186. United Drug Company vs. Petitioner and Appellant, Theodore Rectanus Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. L. A. [illegible], for the petitioner and appellant, and concluded by Mr. Clayton B. Blakey, for the respondent and appellee.

187. John Gund Brewing Company, vs. Appellant, The Great Northern Railway Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann and Mr. Levi Cooke, for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, for the appellee.

188. Hiram W. Smith, Junior,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Washington Southern Railway
Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ralph B. Fleharty, for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear counsel for the defendant in error.

189. The Philippine Sugar Estates
Development Company, Limited,
vs. Plaintiff in Error, and Appellant,
The Government of the Philippine
Islands.

This cause was argued by Mr. Antonio M. Opisso, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edward S. Bailey, for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday. March 14th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Cabell Williamson, it is ordered that Victor L. Dodge, Esquire, of Davenport, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Magee, it is ordered that Virgil N. Coleman, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. R. Kingsman, it is ordered that J. D. Wilkinson, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Wickersham, it is ordered that John J. Finnegan, Esquire, of Seward, of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Boston & Maine Railroad,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
E. G. Piper.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edwin W. Lawrence, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Marvelle . Walton, for the defendant in error.

he United States ex rel. Louisville
ement Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
nterstate Commerce Commission.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Van Dyke Norman, for the plaintiff in error & by Mr. Charles W. Needham, for the defendant in error.

nnette J. McCoy et al., Executors etc.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
e Union Elevated Railroad Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Mecartney, for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. ancis W. Walker, for the defendants in error.

roclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow

Friday, March 18th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward D. [illegible], it is ordered that Ambrose Kennedy, Esquire, of Woonsocket, State of Rhode Island, and Lawrence Beattie Smith, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that John R. Selby, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Curtis H. Lindley, it is ordered that William E. Colby, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. [illegible], it is ordered that Charles Recht, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Thompson, it is ordered that Webster W. Holloway, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John James Smith, it is ordered that Richard B. Leach, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. [illegible], it is ordered that G. W. Morrow, Esquire, of Kansas City, and Silas Lee Harris, Esquire, of Osceola, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Windsor M. Bryant, it is ordered that [illegible] R. [illegible]

and Alonzo Harrison Rowe, Esquires, of Chica
of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorne
Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
209. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
E. S. Holloway, as Administrator etc.

This cause w
to the conside
the Court on
and [illegible]
by Mr. B. D
for the plaint
and by Mr. James W. Clay and Mr. J. F. Clay, f
ant in error.

Metropolitan State Bank,
210. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of Illinois.

On motion of
H. Davis, in
of counsel, it
by the Court t
cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject
provisions of section 9, rule 26.

Cornelia J. McCoy et al., Executors,
190. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Union Elevated Railroad Company et al.

The argume
this caus
continue
Frank
and Mr.
L. Foote, for the defendants in error, and conclu
Mr. Harry S. Mecartney, for the plaintiffs in err

191.	Bethlehem Steel Company vs. Appellant, The United States.	This cause was argued by Mr. James H. Hayden, for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, for the appellee.
196.	Anna Martin, Administratrix etc., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.	This cause was argued by Mr. Henry Mahoney, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Rodger M. Trump, for the defendant in error.
198.	The City of Mitchell, vs. Appellant, Dakota Central Telephone Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lauritz Miller, for the appellant, and continued by Mr. T. H. Null, for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 18th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Ben Bryan, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that John Ross Voigt, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick B. Rees, it is ordered that James B. Diggs, Esquire, of Tulsa, te of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and sellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William llis, it is ordered that Alva M. Lumpkin, Esquire, of Columbia, of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William nnings, it is ordered that Edwin B. Clark, Esquire, of Stigler, of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and ellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence erman, it is ordered that Henry C. Warner, Esquire, of Dixon, y S. Dixon, Esquire, of Dixon, Harry Edwards, Esquire, of , and William J. Emerson, Esquire, of Oregon, State of ois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. cis H. McKenna, it is ordered that Alfred G. Chaffee, ire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to tice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer, it is ordered that Erwin G. Dudley, Esquire

of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practic
attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was d
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behal
A. A. Jones, it is ordered that E. A. Thompson, Esquire, o
State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an at
and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accord

Secundino Omaechevarria,
102. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
State of Idaho.

In Error to the S
Court of the State o
Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of
from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argu
counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordere
adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said S
Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed
costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter;
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Josephus Wells,
103. vs. Appellant,
Daniel C. Roper, First Assistant
Postmaster General of the United States.

Appeal from the C
of Appeals of the D
of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of

record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

[illegible], Surviving
Executor of [illegible],
deceased,
646. vs. Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Union Pacific Railroad
Company
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles A. Hadley, as Administrator
of the Estate of Charles A. [illegible],
deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and

was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It
ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment
Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby
with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

78. Rock Spring Distilling Company
and Silas Rosenfeld,
vs. Petitioners,
W. A. Gaines & Company.

On writ of Cer
the United S
Circuit Court
Appeals for
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the tra
record from the United States Circuit Court of Appea
Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consi
whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decree
Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit
Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reverse
costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the Unit
for the Western District of Kentucky in this cause be, and
is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, a
same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

611. John D. Ireland,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner
of the City of New York.

In error to the Co
Appeals of the S
New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcrip record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Minnie Emma Stadelman et al.,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. H. Miner et al.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby, granted to file the petition for rehearing herein, that the judgment entered on January 7th, 1918, be vacated and set aside and that the case stand for reconsideration under the prior submission.

It is further ordered that the opinion of the Court below rendered on a previous hearing reported in 83 Oregon Reports, page 351, and omitted from the transcript of the record, be considered as a part of said transcript without further formal order to the Court below to supply the same.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anna Martin, Administratrix
of the Estate of Jesse Martin, deceased,
176. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
Railway Company.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of the
State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the

judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause,
the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

858. Thomas E. Bass & Company
M. Motes,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
State of Missouri ex rel.
James P. Newell.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri
motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. O
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adju
this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and
is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

188. Oliver H. Smith, Jr.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Washington Southern Railway
Company.

In Error to the Court
Appeals of the Distri
Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of
from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and wa
by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here orde
adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be,
same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John [illegible] Brewing Company,
187. vs. Appellant,
The Great Northern Railway
Company and the United States.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United States
for the District of
Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edmund Jefferson Bryan,
810. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Louisville & Nashville Railroad
Company.

In Error to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edmund Jefferson Bryan,
810. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

On consideration of the
petition for a writ of
Certiorari, [illegible]

of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
320. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mrs. Marshall Lanis, Administratrix of Marshall Lanis, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss or affirm and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of William H. Blymyer, Petitioner.
— Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

17 Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Frank A. Fisher, Public Administrator of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, as such in charge of the Estate of Bernard J. [illegible], deceased, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw from the files of this Court certain original papers from the files of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, filed as exhibits to the return to the rule to show cause herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

180. Watts, Watts & Company, Limited, Petitioner, vs. Unione Austriaca di Navigazione etc.

On consideration of the motion to restore this case to the call, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case assigned for Monday, April 15th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

259. J. F. [illegible] et al., Appellants, vs. Thomas A. [illegible], Auditor of the [illegible] & [illegible] etc. et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

257. J. F. Shepard et al.
vs. Appellants,
James M. Barkley, Moderator of the
General Assembly etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of appellants to amend the petition for the order allowing the appeal, the order allowing the appeal, and the citation to the appellees herein as set forth in said motion, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted without prejudice to the right of the appellees to renew their objections to the motion at the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

614. The United States of America
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Federal Publishing Company.

615. The United States of America
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Butterick Company.

731. Gulf Oil Corporation,
vs. Petitioner,
C. G. Lewellyn, Collector etc.

733. Louis M. Orr,
vs. Appellant,
Henry M. Allen et al., etc.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, October 7th next, at the head of the call for that day.

The United States of America
and Lee Tompkins Brown,
663. vs. Appellants,
New Orleans Pacific Railway
Company et al.

The United States of America
and William R. Thomas,
664. vs. Appellants,
New Orleans Pacific Railway
Company et al.

The United States of America
and Stephen A. Grant,
665. vs. Appellants,
New Orleans Pacific Railway
Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
342. vs. Appellant,
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
612. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
[illegible] A. [illegible] and Charles W. [illegible].

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

848.
Albert F. Dickinson, Petitioner,
vs.
O. & W. Thum Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

849.
The A. K. Ackerman Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The O. & W. Thum Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The [illegible] Company
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
The [illegible] Company et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Patton Brothers Real Estate
& Investment Company,
850. vs. Petitioner,
W. E. [illegible].

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Ben Mar,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

N. P. Meikleham
879. vs. Petitioner,
Mrs. Virginia M. Grafton.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Paterlini and Mary Paterlini.
880. vs. Petitioners,
Memorial Hospital Association of Monongahela City, Pennsylvania, et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Upper Hudson Stone Company, Petitioner, vs. Joseph Leslie White et al.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Judson Harmon and Rufus B. Smith, Receivers of the Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railway Company, Petitioners, vs. Lucinda Barber, Administratrix the Estate of James C. Barber, eceased.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the ixth Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in pport of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court at the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

888. Armanis F. Knowles, Petitioner, vs. Clark Construction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

889. James Allen, Petitioner, vs. Chicago & Alton Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

907. L. B. Beard & R. B. Beard, Petitioners, vs. Horace L. Payne & Mina Payne.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari

tiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup port of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

d Spear,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

ugo Yanyar,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
e United States of America.
&
tto Yanyar,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
e United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandates in these causes.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

870.
Supreme Conclave, Improved
Order of Heptasophs,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Marshall Wilson.

The petit
of certior
was subm
considera
Court br

Arguments by Mr. John W. Davis, in behalf of
Brown and Mr. [illegible] Bryan, for the plaintiff in
port of the petition, and by Mr. [illegible] M.
defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

650.
Clarence F. Birdseye,
vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner, etc.
&
Kellogg Birdseye,
651.
vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner, etc.

Mr.
Bu
Mr.
[illegible]
for
sub
cons
the

motion to advance these causes.

902.
The City of Cleveland,
vs. Petitioner,
Violet M. Nichols.

The petition for a
tiorari herein was
to the consideration
Court on printed

by Mr. Alfred Clum, for the petitioner, and by
Slattery, for the respondent.

917.
Cooper Hewitt Electric Company,
vs. Petitioner,
General Electric Company.

The petition
of certiorari
submitted to

consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Parker W. Page and Mr. Thomas B. Kerr, for the petitioners, and by Mr. John E. Bennie, for the respondent.

Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted
Masons of the State of Mississippi et al.
867. vs. Petitioners,
Vicksburg Lodge No. 26, of Free &
Accepted Masons, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Robert B. Mayes, for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. C. Bryson, for the respondents.

Charles R. Shaffer,
892. vs. Appellant,
E. B. Howard, State Auditor, etc., et al.

Mr. J. Berry King, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Frederic W. Dowdy,
870. vs. Petitioner,
Henry Alfred Hansen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. W. Bradford and Mr. Charles E. Hughes, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathan Mossd, for the respondent.

Cincinnati Northern Railroad
Company,
900. vs. Petitioner,
Lee Hoey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by
Mr. Harry N. Quigley,

for the petitioner and by Mr. [illegible] and
Alonzo H. Ranes, for the respondent.

227. W. H. [illegible] as Receiver etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ole J. [illegible].

This cause wa
to the considera
the Court on t
and printed ar

by Mr. Edward [illegible] and Mr. [illegible], for the
plaintiff in error and by Mr. [illegible], for the
in error.

229. Peter Marshall,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific
Railway Company.

In Error to the
Court of the State
Minnesota.

This cause having been called for hearing in its
order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have
print the transcript of the record, (R. 10, [illegible]), in pur
the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudge
Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same
dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

198. The City of Mitchell,
vs. Appellant,
Dakota Central Telephone Company.

The argument of
[illegible] was continued
[illegible], for the
and continued by

[illegible] Miller, for the appellant.

200.	York Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. V. B. Colley et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. N. C. Abbott for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.
208.	Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James M. Smith.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William W. Crawford, for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 19th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordan, it is ordered that Henry L. Cavender, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Crawford, it is ordered that Frederick W. Pringle, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, it is ordered that Joseph P. Streuber, Esquire, of Highland, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Kahn, it is ordered that Nathan Rabinowitz, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Russell, it is ordered that Orren Wilson, Esquire, of Cape Girardeau, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas A. Churchill et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
James J. Rafferty, as Collector of
Internal Revenue, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be continued pursuant to a stipulation of Counsel.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. Smith.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Eugene Hubbard, for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William . Thompson, for the plaintiff in error.

The United States,
204. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Whited & Wheless, Limited,
et al.

This cause was sub
the consideration o
Court on the reco
printed argumen
Mr. Assistant A

General [illegible], for the plaintiff in error, and M
J. Alexander and Mr. A. L. Alexander and Mr.
Wilkinson for the defendants in error.
(O

The Northern Pacific
Railway Company,
526. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Duluth Elevator Company.

On motion of Mr
Donnelly, of coun
the plaintiff in
it is ordered by
Court that the c
advanced, to be heard with Numbers 208 and 209.

Northern Pacific Railway
Company,
208. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
M. J. Solum.

Northern Pacific Railway
Company,
209. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Monarch Elevator Company.

Northern Pacific Railway
Company,
526. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Duluth Elevator Company.

These causes were arg
Mr. Charles Donnell
Northern Pacific Ra
Company, by Mr.
Flannery, for the d
in error in No. 2
and submitted by
Ernest E. Watkin
defendants in erro
Nos. 209 and 52

211 = 224.	Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant, vs. City and County of San Francisco et al.	These causes were argued by Mr. Geo. A. Campbell, of counsel for the appellant and by Mr. Robert M. Searls, of counsel for the appellees.
225.	City of Covington, Appellant, vs. South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. E. Stricklett for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 20th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. W. Pancoast, it is ordered that George W. Sutton, Esquire, of Fayetteville, Tennessee, and John C. Madigan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Isaac F. Dawson, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King it is ordered that Richard Bertram Thurman, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert Cox
vs. Appellant,
Major General Leonard Wood,
Commandant of Camp Funston,
in the State of Kansas.

Mr. Hannis Taylor, of Counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Louis Kelley et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of New Mexico on the
relation of the Northwestern
Colonization and Improvement
Company of Chihuahua.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. T. Morgan, Mr. Walter D. Hurst, Mr. Samuel J. Holmes, Mr. A. B. Renehan and Mr. Charles A. Douglas, for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. James P. Gaffney, Mr. W. J. Cable, Mr. Harry [illegible]. Patton and Mr. Francis C. Wilson for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Oregon-Washington Railroad
& Navigation Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Franklin County, State of Washington et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of Counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

237.
Clarence W. Turner,
vs. Appellant,
The United States and
Creek Nation of Indians.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be continued, pursuant to a stipulation of counsel.

238.
The United States,
vs. Appellant.
Walter Ferguson et al.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, of counsel for the appellant, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be passed, subject to the provisions of Section 9, Rule 26.

239.
James F. Taylor et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. E. H. Randolph and Mr. R. C. Milling for the appellants, with leave to counsel for the appellee to file a brief in the cause within two weeks.

225.
City of Covington,
vs. Appellant.
South Covington & Cincinnati
Street Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. E. Stricklett, of
counsel for the

by Mr. Alfred C. [illegible], of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. A. C. Stricklett, of counsel for the appellant.

Frank M. Knight,
228. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Mexico.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. B. Thompson, for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on printed argument by Mr. Harry L. Patton, for the defendant in error.

Zoilo Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet et al.,
230. vs. Appellants,
The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation et al.

Joaquin Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet et al.,
231. vs. Appellants,
The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Antonio M. Opisso, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 21, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Burford, it is ordered that Guy L. [illegible], Esquire, of Stillwater, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that John H. Miller, Esquire, of Seattle, and Howard A. [illegible], Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, and Sam H. [illegible], Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that Lewis Wilson, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dis. Navy Yard Route
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
N. E. Devlin.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Con. The Southwestern Telegraph & Telephone Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of Dallas, Texas.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be continued until the next term, pursuant to a stipulation of counsel.

Ar. Julio Alvarez de Mendoza y Palet et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corporation et al.

Ar. Joaquin Alvarez de Mendoza y Palet et al.
vs. Appellants,
Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corporation.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Antonio M.

Spiro, for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Charles Cowles Tucker, for the appellees. Leave was granted to Mr. Tucker to file a brief herein within four days, and to Mr. Spiro to file a reply thereto within four days thereafter.

H. A. Moss and E. F. Bumford,
232. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
C. C. Moore et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John R. Selby, for defendants in error, and submitted on printed argument by Mr. A. E. Shaw, for plaintiffs in error.

United States Glue Company,
233. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Town of Oak Creek.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Lines, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. J. Killilea and Mr. Walter Drew, for the defendant in error.

The Grand Trunk Western
Railway Company,
115. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. T. Michener, for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 22, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morris Adams, it is ordered that Howard Webster Adams, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that Frank Branch Riley, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Montague, it is ordered that John N. Sebrell, Junior, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, it is ordered that [illegible] D. Beaulieu, Esquire, of White Earth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Junior, it is ordered that A. B. Lovett, Esquire, of Atlanta, and Samuel M. Oliver, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

746. James Hallagan, et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Simeon A. Dowell.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Thereupon, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

200.	The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Wisconsin.	This cause was argued by Mr. Harry L. Butler, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Walter Drew, for the defendant in error.
243.	Frank N. Jefferson et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William G. Fink et al., as Administrators etc.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John T. Mayo, for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. George S. Ramsey, for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 25th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Fitts, it is ordered that Alexander T. Howard, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. J. Hurley, it is ordered that George S. Ramsey, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George
[illegible], it is ordered that Oscar Whitaker, Esquire, of Birmingham,
ate of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor
this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.
homas A. Connolly, it is ordered that Ellis Levin, Esquire, of
Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney
nd counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles
Needham, it is ordered that Laurence B. Evans, Esquire, of
Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an
ttorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas
B. Cooper, it is ordered that Thomas B. Gay, Esquire, of Richmond,
tate of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-
llor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.
Wordsworth Stetson, it is ordered that William Watson Smith,
squire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to
practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was
worn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by
r. J. L. Burnett, it is ordered that George Huddleston,
quire, of Birmingham, and Edmund H. Dryer, Esquire,
Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to

practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Miles D. Reeves, Esquire, and R. C. Sewell, Esquire, of Palestine, State of Texas, and A. B. Dickinson, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that William Buchholz, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

178. Fields S. Pendleton,
vs. Petitioner,
Benner Line.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

e Grand Trunk Western
ailway Company,
vs. Appellant.
e United States.

Appeal from the
Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record
m the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration
hereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this
peal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of juris-
tion.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

enkins T. Collard, Administrator
the Estate of Samuel T. Collard,
ceased,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
ttsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago &
Louis Railway.

In Error to the Court
of Appeals of the
State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record
the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and on motion
dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration
ereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court
t the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby,
smissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

altimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
homas N. Smith.

In Error to the Court of
Appeals of the State of
Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank M Knight,
228. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Mexico.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

H. A. Moss and G. F. Bradford,
232. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
C. C. Moore, The Union Trust Company of San Francisco, Administrator with the will annexed of Peter Martin, deceased, and H. W. Pillsbury.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and

e argument by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here
ered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause
and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

ence F. Bindseye,
vs. Appellant,
thur Woods, Police Commissioner
e City of New York.

hoff Bindseye,
vs. Appellant,
thur Woods, Police Commissioner
e City of New York.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

bert Cox,
vs. Appellant,
r General Leonard Wood,
mandant of Camp Funston
e State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause
signed for argument on Monday, April 15th next, after the cases
tofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

arles B. Shaffer,
vs. Appellant,
E. Howard, State Auditor of the
e of Oklahoma and John S. Woofter,
of Creek County, State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the

Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, [illegible] next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Supreme Conclave, Improved Order of Heptasophs,
890. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Marshall Wilson.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Craig Mountain Lumber Company, Limited,
897. vs. Petitioner,
James [illegible].

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as in opposition to the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Luis Muller, William J. Cox,
J. Lindauer, et al.
803. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of New Mexico on the relation of The [illegible]

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and of the argu- ment of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by his Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederic W. Goudy,
vs. Petitioner,
enry Alfred Hansen, Executor
f N. C. Hansen, deceased.

On petition for writ of cer- tiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, nd of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said etition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

rand Lodge of Free and Accepted
Masons of the State of Mississippi et al.
vs. Petitioners,
icksburg Lodge No. 26 of Free and
ccepted Masons et al.

On petition for writ of Cer- tiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of nsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

900. Cincinnati Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Leo Gray.

On petitio
Certiora
Court of
Michiga

On consideration of the petition for a writ of
to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and
of Counsel thereupon here, as well in support of
same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the
and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

902. The City of Cleveland, Petitioner, vs. Viola M. Nichols.

On petition for writ
the United States C
Appeals for the Si

On consideration of the petition for a writ of Cer
to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Circuit, and of the argument of Counsel thereupon here as well in supp
it is now here ordered by this Court that the said
and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

917. Cooper Hewitt Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. General Electric Company.

On petition f
tiorari to the
States Circui
Appeals for

On consideration of the petition for a writ of
herein to the United States Circuit Court of Ap

Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as in opposition to the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 623, 657, 640, 752, 738, 739, 799, 650, and 651, be, and they are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, April 15th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice also announced that there will be no session of the Court on the 29th instant, that day being Good Friday.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, April 1, to Monday April 15, next.

1444.	Nelson C. Sheckels, Surviving Executor of Theodore Sheckels, deceased, vs. Appellant, The District of Columbia.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that the mandate issue in this cause.
20 Orig.	State of Minnesota, vs. Complainant, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for defendants, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause.

Rhodes E. Cave et al.,
859. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Missouri ex rel.
James P. Newell.

On motion of Mr
Assistant in b
Counsel for the
in error, It is
by the Court

mandate issue in this cause.

W. W. Sterrett, as Receiver etc.,
901. vs. Petitioner,
Second National Bank of
Cincinnati, Ohio.

The petition for
Certiorari herein
United States
Court of Appea
Sixth Circuit

mitted to the consideration of the Court on printed a
by Mr. Edmund W. Dyer and Mr. Torrey Johnston
Petitioner.

Thomas J. Evans, Sole Surviving
Receiver etc.,
916. vs. Petitioner,
National Bank of Savannah.

The petition for
Certiorari herein
Court of Appe
State of Georgi
submitted to the

ation of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. L.
behalf of Mr. Frederick T. Saussy for the petitioner, and
William Garrard and Mr. Edward S. Elliott for the

Consolidation Coal Company,
893. vs. Petitioner,
Carrie Salyer, Administratrix
etc.

The petition for a
tiorari herein to the
States Circuit Cour
Appeals for the S
Circuit were submitte

Consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George N. Lamar in behalf of Mr. [illegible] O'Rear for the petitioners.

20 Orig.
State of Minnesota, Complainant,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles R. Pierce, of counsel for complainant, leave is hereby granted to file a brief for complainant in this cause. The motion to set down motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Pierce, for complainant.

868.
John Dillon,
vs.
Strathearn Steamship Company, Claimant, etc.

Mr. Charles A. Conlon, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause. A motion for leave to intervene herein and file brief as amicus curiae and make oral argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Conlon, in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, counsel for the British Embassy.

916.
Compania Palmas de Terrenos y Grandos et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Sigmund Lindauer et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James R. [illegible], Mr. [illegible] & Mr. [illegible] Wilson, for the petitioners, and by Mr. [illegible], Mr. Samuel T. [illegible], Mr. A. R. [illegible] and Mr. Charles A. Douglas, for the respondents.

906. The [illegible] [illegible] Company, Petitioner, vs. T. A. [illegible], Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Ap[peals for] the Fifth Circuit [submitted] to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by [illegible] [illegible], in behalf of Mr. B. G. Cummings, for the petitioner; [and by Mr.] Charles A. Boynton and Mr. James B. Williamson, for the resp[ondent].

908. Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner, vs. First National Bank of Montgomery, Alabama.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court [of Appeals] for the Fifth Circuit submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William A. Rankin, [illegible] L. Clark and Mr. S. S. [illegible], for the petitioner; and by Mr. [illegible] Stringfellow, Mr. B. P. Crum and Mr. Tom Weil for the re[spondent].

598. James S. Hopkins, as Receiver etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America for use and benefit of Ellington & Guy (Inc.) et al.

The motion to dis[miss or] affirm in this ca[se] submitted to the C[onsidera]tion of the Court [by Mr.] A. B. Dickinson [for the] defendants in err[or in] support of the motion, and by Mr. Mark W. Brown and [Mr.] Albert G. Hopkins for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition [illegible]

816. Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Edwin J. Hill, Junior, an infant etc.

Mr. Raymond [illegible] and [Mr.] J. Murphy, of counsel for the resp[ondent], submitted to the consideration [of the Court] a motion to [illegible] this case [illegible]

228 Louis N. Jefferson et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
D. N. Fink et al., as
Administrators etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George W. Ramsey, for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. James M. Hays, for the plaintiffs in error.

743 International & Great Northern
Railway Company et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Anderson County et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. M. Garwood, for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. F. D. McKenney and Mr. J. B. Greenwood, for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 26th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank Key Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that Clement Brumbaugh, Esquire, of Columbus, and William D. Brumbaugh and George W. Mannix, Jr., Esquires, of Greenville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Whelan, it is ordered that Albert D. [illegible], Esquire, of Hyannis, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Rune Nielsen et al.,
936. vs. Petitioners,
The Rhine Shipping Company,
Claimant of the Sailing Ship
Rhine.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Fayette B. Dow in behalf of Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, for the petitioners, and by Mr Roscoe H. Hupper, for the respondent.

John Nordy et al.
937. vs. Petitioners,
Shepard and Morse Lumber
Company, Claimant of the
Barkentine "Windrush."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Fayette B. Dow in behalf of Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, for the respondents.

Ex parte: In the matter of
Hassan Abdu et al.,
— Orig. Petitioners.

Mr. Fayette B. Dow, in behalf of Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

Erik Manning et al.
938. vs. Petitioners,
John McDonald, Claimant of
the British Ship "Talus."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration, of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander S. Howard and Mr. W. J. Waguespack, for the petitioners.

International and Great Northern
Railway Company et al.,
243. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Anderson County et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. T. B. Greenwood for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the plaintiffs in error.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor etc., et al.,
245. vs. Appellants,
Gipsy Oil Company.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor etc., et al.,
246. vs. Appellants,
Indian Territory Illuminating
Oil Company.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor etc., et al.,
247. vs. Appellants
Okla Oil Company.

and

E. B. Howard, as Auditor etc., et al.,
248. vs. Appellants,
Barnsdall Oil Company.

These causes were argued by Mr. [illegible] D. Diggs, by counsel for the appellee in No. 245 and by Mr. John H. Burford, of counsel for the appellees in Nos. 246, 247 and 248, and submitted by counsel for the appellants, with leave to the latter to file briefs within twenty days, and to counsel for the appellees to file reply briefs within fifteen days thereafter.

249. Jim Butler Tonopah Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
West End Consolidated Mining Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Curtis H. Lindley, for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 27, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Samuel A. Ammon, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Wilson, it is ordered that Walt E. Humphrey, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stuart G. Gibboney, it is ordered that Rhodie Fleman Higley, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, it is ordered that William Wright Moore, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that Morris G. Michaels, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

265. T. M. Aikins,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. T. Kingsbury, as Register
of the State Land Office.

On motion of Mr. J. F. Peck in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. Fred W. Lake to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

756. B. F. Looney, Attorney General
of the State of Texas, et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Eastern Texas Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William A. Vinson in behalf of Mr. J. W. Terry, Mr. Hiram Glass and Mr. N. A. Stedman for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. B. F. Looney and Mr. Luther Nickels for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Hyman L. Siegelschiffer, Petitioner. Mr. Louis J. Vorhaus as counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this case.

260. The Bank of Oxford et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. J. S. Love et al. Bank Examiners of the State of Mississippi. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George B. [illegible], for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Robert H. Thompson, for the defendants in error.

249. Jim Butler Tonopah Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. West End Consolidated Mining Company. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Curtis H. Lindley, for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. W. H. Dickson, for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Curtis H. Lindley, for the plaintiff in error.

101. Oliver B. [illegible], Administrator etc., Appellant, vs. The United States. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King, for appellant, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Huston Thompson, for appellee, and concluded by Mr. George A. King, for appellant.

280. Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Vilas for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 28th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Stafford, it is ordered that Ora Bill Brown, Esquire, of Dayton, and Charles E. Kearns and Eli N. Spencer, Esquires, of Batavia, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

568. International News Service, Petitioner, vs. The Associated Press.

On motion of Mr. Samuel Untermyer, for the petitioner, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be specially assigned for argument on April 15th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy
Railroad Company, Chicago
Great Western Railroad Company
et al.
[illegible] vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
St. Paul Association of Commerce
and The Minneapolis Civic and
Commerce Association.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Marion-Wyandot Lighting
Company,
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Village of Upper Sandusky.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be continued until the next term, pursuant to a stipulation of counsel.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway
Company,
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles A. Vilas for the petitioner, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Charles A. Vilas for the petitioner.

254. Central of Georgia Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Birdie V. Deloach. This cause was argued by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Junior, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Francis M. Oliver, for the defendant in error.

255. Byron S. Waite et al., as The Board of Tea Appeals, Appellants, vs. George H. Macy et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren for the appellants, and by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Junior, for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 1st, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Fitts, it is ordered that White E. Gibson, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, it is ordered that Henry G. Miller, Esquire, of East Saint Louis, and August H. Baer, Esquire, of Belleville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Mrs. Effie King Nance, of

Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David, it is ordered that John F. McCarron and Aubrey C. Van Fleet, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

New York Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
378. vs.
Leo F. Dodge.

In Error to the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Springfield Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Springfield Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ex parte In the matter
of Hassan Abdu et al.,
Petitioners.
... Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter
of Hassan Abdu et al.,
Petitioners.
... Orig.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by William Parkin, Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, April 29th, 1918, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the matter of
Hyman L. Siegelschiffer,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

State of Minnesota,
vs. Complainant,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary
of the Interior, et al.
20 Orig.

On consideration of the motion to set down the motion to dismiss in this cause for oral argument, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the said motion to dismiss is set down for oral argument on Monday, the 15th instant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company,
846. vs. Petitioner,
Edwin J. Hilt, Junior, an infant,
by his next friend, and Edwin
J. Hilt, Sr.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Dillon,
868. vs.
Strathearn Steamship Company,
Claimant of Steamship "Strathearn".

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Dillon,
868. vs.
Strathearn Steamship Company,
Claimant of Steamship "Strathearn".

On consideration of the motion on behalf of the British Embassy for leave to intervene herein as amicus curiae and to file brief and take part in the oral argument, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

B. F. Looney, Attorney General,
and Luther Nickels, Assistant
Attorney General, of the State
of Texas,
756. vs. Appellants,
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. C. Sherrill, as Receiver of
The Alabama Trust & Savings
Company,
901. vs. Petitioner,
Second National Bank of
Cincinnati, Ohio.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erik Sandberg, Ernst Johnson,
J. A. Benjaminsen and John
Pearson
935. vs. Petitioners,
John A. McDonald, Claimant of
the British Ship "Talus".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

936.
Paul Nielsen et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Rhine Shipping Company,
Claimant of the Sailing
Ship "Rhine".

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

937.
John Nardy, et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Shepard & Morse Lumber Company,
Claimant of the Barkentine
"Windrush".

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon here, as well in support of as against the;

same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

873.

Consolidation Coal Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Fannie Salyer, Administratrix of
the Estate of Raleigh Reese,
deceased.

On petition for writ of
Certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

906.

The Cooper Grocery Company,
vs. Petitioner
J. A. Penland, Trustee of the
Estate of Christian Brothers,
Bankrupts.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Fifth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

908.

Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner,
vs.
First National Bank of Montgomery, Alabama.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

915.

Compania Palomas de Terrenos y Ganados, Sociedad Anonima, and Compania de [illegible] de Agua y Colonizacion, Sociedad Anonima, Petitioners,
vs.
Sigmund Lindauer and Arthur A. Temke.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 1st, 1918, Continued.

912. Tom Wells, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.
and
913. Simp Patterson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari in these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Stone Hoskins, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, for the respondent.

961. Rensselaer & Saratoga Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Roscoe Irwin, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. B. Wellington, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the respondent.

[illegible] White Queen Mining Company, Petitioner, vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, Mr. Charles A. [illegible] and Mr. W. E. F. Deal, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Christopher M. Bradley, for the respondents

574. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Clark N. Rice.

On motion of Mr. [illegible] D. Tyler, in behalf of counsel, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be advanced pursuant to the thirty-second rule. The cause was submitted on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, Mr. Henry H. Chaffe and Mr. Henry L. Stone, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. M. Milling, for the defendant in error.

899. Franklin Shaw and John F. Palmer, Appellants, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Fox and Mr. Charles H. Keene for the appellants, in support of the petition.

923. E. C. Martin, substituted by Charles B. Martin, Administrator etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Board of Supervisors of Greene County, Iowa, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. T. Milam in behalf of Mr. B. M. Bennett, for the petitioners.

[illegible]. William B. Baker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

Mr. Harry Weinberger, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

918. The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Wallace, Junior, Mr. John G. Milburn and Mr. Arthur F. Shores, for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Welwood Murray, Mr. J. A. Bowie and Mr. W. R. Begg, for the respondent.

914. South Coast Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. J. C. Rudnbach.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. L. Sturtevant in behalf of Mr. Oliver Dibble, for the petitioner.

242. International & Great Northern Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Anderson County et al.

On motion of Mr. Samuel B. Dabney, for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief for the plaintiffs in error in this cause.

Pedro Gutierrez,
287. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Walter B. Grant, Independent
Executor of the Estate of Frank
B. Cotton, deceased.

In Error to the District
Court of the United
States for the Western
District of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, costs in this Court to be paid by the defendant in error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 15, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 15th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Arthur W. Parry, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, and Harry A. Willson, Esquire, of Saint Louis, State of Missouri, were admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that John C. Vivian and Clarence W. McCutchen, Esquires, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. W. Pancoast, it is ordered that James [illegible], of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien, it is ordered that William M. Hendren, Esquire, of Winston Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter S. Carter, it is ordered that William Tatham, Esquire, of Englewood, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that John A. Sherman, Esquire, of Broken Arrow, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, it is ordered that Francis J. [illegible], Esquire, of St. Paul, Egbert S. Oakley, Esquire, of Duluth, and Alexander E. Horn, Esquire of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Johnston, it is ordered that Edmund K. Trent, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic W. McKenney, it is ordered that Glen E. Smith, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Percy W. Metz, Esquire, of Basin, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Cist, it is ordered that Frank A. Whiteley, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, and Dwight S. Marfield, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Bynum Junior, it is ordered that Fred J. Coxe, Esquire, of Wadesboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. B. Ashel, it is ordered that Arthur L. Burgess, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, it is ordered that Samuel A. King, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert N. Thompson, Administrator of the Estate of John N. Thompson, deceased,
Appellant,
184. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
204. vs.
Whited & Wheless, Limited, et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of

the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

	Bethlehem Steel Company,	Appeal from the
No.	vs. Appellant,	Court of Claims.
	The United States.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

	Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,	In Error to the Court
209.	vs. Plaintiff in Error,	of Appeals of the State
	E. S. Holloway, as Administrator of the Estate of John G. Holloway, deceased.	of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States,
325. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas Soldana and
Francisco Herrera.

In Error to the District
Court of the United States
for the District of
Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States,
509. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Fred W. Weitzel.

In Error to the District Court of
the United States for the Eastern
District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern

District of Kentucky, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

644. Minnie Eva Stadelman, Henry Rice Fletcher and John W. Motley, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. H. Miner and Charles Worden. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

176. The Dalton Adding Machine Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the State Corporation Commission. In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals for the State of Virginia, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

177.
General Railway Signal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia at the relation of the State Corporation Commission.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

250.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern

District of Illinois for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States,
468 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph L. Schider, trading as
Jos. L. Schider & Company.

In Error to the District
Court of the United States
for the Southern District of
New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; And that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Manufacturers Railway Company
and St. Louis Southwestern Railway
Company,
24. vs. Appellants,
The United States and Interstate
Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United States
for the Eastern District of
Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Manufacturers Railway Company,
Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, et al.,
25. vs. Appellants,
The United States and Interstate
Commerce Commission

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Salt Lake Investment
Company,
29. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Oregon Short Line Railroad
Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Cudahy Packing Company,
32. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Minnesota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Great Northern Railway Company
and Willmar and Sioux Falls
Railway Company,
185. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Minnesota ex rel.
Village of Clara City.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Boston & Maine Railroad,
208. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
E. G. Piper.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

City of Covington,
225. vs. Appellant,
South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke,

International & Great Northern
Railway Company et al.,
242. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Anderson County, City of Palestine,
George A. Wright, et al.

In Error to the Court of Civil
Appeals, Sixth Supreme
Judicial District, State of
Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Sixth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The City of Mitchell,
198. vs. Appellant,
Dakota Central Telephone
Company.

Appeal from the District Court
of the United States for the
District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

437.	H. A. A. Smith, Auditor of the Panama Canal, Pl'ff in Error, vs. William H. Jackson.	In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

211.	Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant, vs. City and County of San Francisco and Tax Collector of said City and County.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant,
212. vs.
City and County of San Francisco and Tax Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant,
213. vs.
City and County of San Francisco and Tax Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

214.

Spring Valley Water Company
vs. Appellant,
City and County of San Francisco
and Tax Collector of said City
and County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

215.

Spring Valley Water Company,
vs. Appellant,
City and County of San Francisco and Tax
Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

216. Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant,
vs.
City & County of San Francisco & Tax Collector of said City & County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

217. Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant,
vs.
City & County of San Francisco & Tax Collector of said City & County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 15th, 1918. Continued.

218.
Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant,
vs.
City and County of San Francisco & the Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

219.
Spring Valley Water Company, Appellant,
vs.
City and County of San Francisco & the Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

230.	Spring Valley Water Company, vs. Appellant, City and County of San Francisco and Tax Collector of said City and County.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

231.	Spring Valley Water Company, vs. Appellant, City and County of San Francisco and Tax Collector of said City and County.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

222. Spring Valley Water Company,
vs. Appellant,
City and County of San Francisco & Tax
Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Ninth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; And that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

223. Spring Valley Water Company,
vs. Appellant,
City and County of San Francisco & Tax
Collector of said City and County.

Appeal from the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Ninth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

224. Spring Valley Water Company,
vs. Appellant,
City and County of San Francisco & the
Controller of said City and County.

Appeal from the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James F. Taylor, Henry Hardtner
and August Mann,
230. vs. Appellants,
The United States.

Appeal from the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Central of Georgia Railway Company,
254. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Birdie V. Deloach.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James S. Hopkins, as Receiver of the Illinois Surety Company,
598. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America, suing for the use and benefit of Ellington & Guy, Inc., et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William P. Pierce,
898. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thomas J. Evans, sole surviving Receiver of the Citizens & Screven County Bank,
916. vs. Petitioner,
National Bank of Savannah.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

South Coast Steamship Company,
919. vs. Petitioner,
J. E. Rudbach.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel ~~thereupon had, as well~~ in support of ~~as against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

914.

West End Street Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

941.

Rensselaer & Saratoga Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Roscoe Irwin, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

896.	White Dutch Mining Company, vs. Petitioner, Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Helen W. Angus.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

899.	Franklin Shaw and John F. Palmer, vs. Appellants, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.	On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia,

and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tom Hollis,
912. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Simp Patterson,
913. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company,
918. vs. Petitioner,
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

923

J. E. Harker, substituted by Charles R. Harker, Administrator etc., et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Board of Supervisors of Greene County, Iowa, et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and of the argument of counsel ~~thereupon had, as well~~ in support of ~~as against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible]

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Wan Shee.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

877. The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. T. Doremus.
and
883. W. S. Webb et al., vs. The United States of America.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States of America, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

— Orig. Ex parte The United States, Petitioner.

On motion of the Attorney General suggesting that following the order herein entered on the 4th day of February, 1918, the respondent John M. Killits, District Judge, entered on February 8, 1918, an order vacating and setting aside the order of December 26, 1917, complained of in the petition herein, and that the records and orders of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio in the case of The United States v. James [illegible] are at this time in a state of conformity to the mandate of this Court,

It is ordered that this proceeding be discontinued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Orig. In re Albert [illegible], Petitioner.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in support of the petition, submitted to the consideration of the Court a petition for the appointment of a commission of the Court.

963. James C. Harris, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Daniel W. Baker and Mr. Alva A. Andrews, for the petitioner.

705. The Portsmouth Harbor Land
& Hotel Company et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank W. Hackett and Mr. John Lowell, for the appellants, in support of the motion, with leave to the Solicitor General to file opposition thereto within one week.

610. Citizens Bank of Michigan
City, Indiana,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Opperman.

A suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jeremiah C. Collins and Mr. Worth W. Pepple, for the plaintiff in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Samuel Parker, for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

610. Citizens Bank of Michigan
City, Indiana,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Opperman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jeremiah C. Collins and Mr. Worth W. Pepple, for the plaintiff in error, in support of the petition, and by Mr. Samuel Parker for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Candelaria Cardona,
372. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Walter B. Grant, sole Executor &c.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Walter B. Grant and Mr. F. G. Hall, for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. F. L. Morris for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company et al.,
922. vs. Petitioners,
American Valve & Meter Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William S. Hodges and Mr. [illegible] Chappell, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles A. [illegible] and Mr. Dwight S. Marfield, for the respondents.

Rederiaktiebolaget Amie,
949. vs. Petitioner,
Universal Transportation Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William J. Conlen, for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, for the respondent.

Monday, April 15th, 1918, Continued.

Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh et al.
762. vs. Petitioners,
First-Second National Bank of Pittsburgh et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. J. Stambaugh and Mr. John M. Freeman, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alexander J. Barron, for the respondents.

W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., and William F. Gray,
757. vs. Petitioners,
Guaranty Trust Company of New York, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. David Hunter Miller and Mr. Gordon Auchincloss, for the petitioners, and by Emanuel J. Myers and Mr. Gordon S. P. Kleeberg, for the respondents.

Edward B. Pryor et al.,
Receivers etc.,
695. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
[illegible] Christy, Administratrix etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. L. T. Michener, in behalf of Mr. Bruce [illegible], for defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. James L. Minnis, for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Mariano Lim,
933. vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, for the respondent.

The Public Utilities Commission
for the State of Kansas et al.
693. vs. Appellants,
John M. Landon, as Receiver etc.

Kansas City, Missouri, et al.,
816. vs. Appellants,
John M. Landon, Receiver etc., et al.

Kansas City Gas Company et al.,
817. vs. Appellants,
Kansas Natural Gas Company, et al.

The Public Utilities Commission
for the State of Kansas et al.,
856. vs. Appellants,
John M. Landon, as Receiver etc.,
et al.

Mr. Barry Mohun, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to consolidate and advance these causes.

Liverpool, Brazil & River Plate
Steam Navigation Company,
964. vs. Petitioner,
Brooklyn Eastern District
Terminal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman B. Beecher, in behalf of Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel Park and Mr. Henry E. Mattison, for the respondent.

927. Sam Sawyer et al., surviving members etc., et al. vs. Petitioners, Sarah Catharine Woodward.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Levi Cooke, in behalf of Mr. Charles A. Boynton for the petitioners.

936. Paul Nielsen et al., vs. Petitioners, Prime Shipping Company, Claimant etc.

&

937. John Hardy et al., vs. Petitioners, Hopkins & Morse Lumber Company, Claimant etc.

Mr. Silas B. Axtell, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

938. Erik Sandberg et al., vs. Petitioners, John McDonald, Claimant etc.

Mr. Silas B. Axtell, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

921. New York Central Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The City of Chicago.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Sidney F. [illegible], Mr. Robert J. Cary, Mr. F. Horace [illegible], Mr. M. L. Bell and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioners.

3 Orig. The People of the State of New York, Complainants, vs. State of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next.

335. Donald A. Curran, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Chicago Short Line Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Rothmann for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. [illegible] for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

353. The Arkadelphia Milling Company, Appellant, vs. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al.

The motions to dismiss in Nos. 353 and 354 were submitted to the consideration of the

354. Joseph F. Hardy et al. etc.,
vs. Appellants,
St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company et al.

St. Louis Iron Mountain &
Southern Railway Company et al.
355. vs. Appellants,
The Southern Cotton Oil
Company.
&
St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company et al.,
356. vs. Appellants,
The Southern Cotton Oil
Company.

Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. J. M. Moore for the appellees, in support of the motion; and by Mr. J. F. Loughborough and Mr. W. E. Hemingway, for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

The motions to dismiss in Nos. 355 and 356 were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. J. F. Loughborough and Mr. W. E. Hemingway, for the appellees, in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. M. Moore, for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Mississippi Central Railroad
Company,
296. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Wade Lott.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Thereupon, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. B. Shoemaker, R. M. Skipper
et al.
446. vs. Appellants,
The Trustees of the Internal
Improvement Fund of the State
of Florida et al.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United
States for the Southern
District of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

State of Iowa,
... Orig.l vs. Complainant,
Abraham Slimmer, Junior, et al.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was argued by Mr. H. M. Havner, for the complainant, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, for the defendants, in opposition thereto.

State of Minnesota,
20 Orig.l vs. Complainant,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary
of the Interior, et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, for the defendants, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles R. Pierce, for the complainant, in opposition thereto.

Monday, April 15th, 1918, continued.

704.

W. C. Hammer, United States
Attorney etc.,
vs. Appellant,
Roland H. Dagenhart et al.

The argument of this cause
was commenced by Mr.
Solicitor General Davis,
of Counsel for the
appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until
tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 16th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Frank J. Kelly, Esquire, of Scipio, State of Indiana, William E. Knapp, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, and Robert [illegible] Mack, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Hegarty, it is ordered that William H. Delaney and James B. Flynn, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe B. Thompson, it is ordered that William C. Hull, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that George D. Parkinson, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

934. C. J. Cashiell, Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Lewis T. Fitzhugh, Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court, as of the 15th instant, on printed arguments, by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff in behalf of Mr. Walter C. Chandler for the petitioners.

704. W. C. Hammer, United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, Appellant, vs. Roland H. Dagenhart et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the appellant, by Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien and Mr. W. M. Hendren, for appellees, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for appellant.

756.	B. F. Looney, Attorney General of the State of Texas, et al. vs. Appellants, Eastern Texas Railway Company et al. J. W. Terry, for appellee.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Luther Nickels, for appellants, and continued by Mr.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Wednesday, April 17th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Price, it is ordered that George Carlton Comstock, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, it is ordered that Abraham A. Silberberg, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Mason, it is ordered that Seymour Stedman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thaddeus H. Caraway, it is ordered that Edward E. Alexander, Esquire, of Blytheville, Thomas E. Toler, Esquire, of Harrison, and George W. Hays, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

756. B. F. Looney, Attorney General of the State of Texas, Appellants, vs. Eastern Texas Railway Company, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. W. Terry, for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Luther Nickels, for the appellant.

180. Watts, Watts & Company, Limited, Petitioner, vs. Unione Austriaca di Navigazione etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Woolsey, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Haight, for the respondent.

833.	Robert Cox, vs. Appellant, Major General Leonard Wood, Commandant of Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Hannis Taylor, for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, April 18th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Arthur S. Dayton, Esquire, of Philippi, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry McAllister, Junior, it is ordered that Alexander R. Baldwin, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dan B. Shields, it is ordered that John Jensen, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sydney Anderson, it is ordered that George J. Steiger, Junior, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert Noble, it is ordered that James A. Foley, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

833.	Robert Cox, vs. Appellant, Major General Leonard Wood, Commandant of Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Hannis Taylor, for the appellant, by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Hannis Taylor, for the appellant.
623.	Union Pacific Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, L. A. Laughlin.	This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, for the defendant in error, and submitted on printed arguments by Mr. N. H. Loomis, Mr. T. A. Watson and Mr. R. W. Blair, for the plaintiff in error.

657.	Peter Chelentis, vs. Petitioner, Luckenbach Steamship Company etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Peter A. Carter, for the defendant in error.
640.	Chicago & Alton Railroad Company, vs. Petitioner, The United States of America.	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Silas H. Strawn and Mr. William L. Patton, for petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for respondent.
752.	Louis H. Perlman, vs. Appellant & Plaintiff in Error, The United States.	This cause was argued by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellant and plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, for the appellee and defendant in error.
735.	Jacob M. Dickinson, (as Receiver etc., vs. Plaintiff in Error, George C. Stiles.	The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Edmund S. Stringer, for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. George A. Lamar, for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, April 19th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John H. Crooker, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, Edward Kohfeld, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and Lester B. Donahue, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Johnstone, it is ordered that Henry W. Pollock, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
George Whitelock, it is ordered that Ogle Marbury,
Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice
Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was du
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
Charles Neave, it is ordered that Clarence D. Kerr,
New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice
Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was du
ingly.

The United States of America, — The petition for a w
952. vs. Petitioner, — tiorari herein to the U
Henry Veeder. — States Circuit Cour
for the Seventh Circ
submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed
by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the petitioner, and by
J. Healy and Mr. George P. McCabe for the respondent.

Jacob M. Dickinson, as Receiver etc., — The argument
735. vs. Plaintiff in Error, — cause was con
George E. Stiles. — Mr. George
for the defenda

E. H. Emery & Company, — This cause was argued
34. vs. Appellant, — Whitman, for the appella
American Refrigerator Transit — mitted on printed argume
Company. — Paul W. Coleman, for
appellee.

George F. Montgomery,
799. vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police
Commissioner of the City of New York.

Clarence F. Birdseye,
650. vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner
of the City of New York.
and
Kellogg Birdseye
651. vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner
of the City of New York.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Charles L. Craig, for appellants in Nos. 650 and 651, continued by Mr. Herbert Noble, for appellant in No. 799 and Mr. Robert S. Johnstone and Mr. Edmund K. Trent, for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Herbert Noble, for the appellant in No. 799.

William N. Miner,
170. vs. Petitioner,
The T. H. Symington
Company.
and
The T. H. Symington
Company,
226. vs. Petitioner,
The National Malleable
Castings Company et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. George I. Haight, for petitioner in No. 170, and continued by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter for the respondent in No. 170 and the petitioner in No. 226.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

On motion first made to the Court in this beha
George Whitelock, it is ordered that Clyde Mackenzie, Es
Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice
attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was du
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behal
Charles Neave, it is ordered that Clarence D. Kerr, E
New York, State of New York, be admitted to practi
attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was du
ingly.

The United States of America, The petition for a w
952. vs. Petitioner, tiorari herein, to the U
Henry Vester. States Circuit Cour
for the Seventh Cir
submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed a
by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the petitioner, and by
J. Kelly and Mr. George P. McCabe for the respondent.

Jacob M. Dickinson, as Receiver etc., The argument
735. vs. Plaintiff in Error, cause was con
George E. Stiles. Mr. George W
for the defenda

E. H. Emery & Company, This cause was argued b
734. vs. Appellant. Whitman, for the appellan
American Refrigerator Transit submitted on printed argume
Company. Paul W. Johnson, Jr
appellee.

799. George F. Montgomery,
vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police
Commissioner of the City of New York.

and

650. Clarence F. Birdseye,
vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner
of the City of New York.

and

651. Kellogg Birdseye
vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner
of the City of New York.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Charles L. Craig, for appellants in Nos. 650 and 651, continued by Mr. Herbert Noble, for appellant in No. 799 and by Mr. Robert S. Johnstone and Mr. Edmund K. Trent, for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Herbert Noble, for the appellant in No. 799.

170. William N. Miner
vs. Petitioner,
The T. H. Symington
Company.

and

226. The T. H. Symington
Company,
vs. Petitioner,
The National Malleable
Castings Company et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. George I. Haight, for petitioner in No. 170, and continued by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter for the respondent in No. 170 and the petitioner in No. 226.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 22, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that William S. Moorhead, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that William M. Robinson, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Sterling, it is ordered that William J. Graham, Esquire, of Aledo, and Niels Juul, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Browne, it is ordered that Roy A. Van Doren, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that W. C. Duncan, Esquire, of Ada, State of Oklahoma, and Jesse F. Holt, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that W. Stuart Symington, Junior, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William V. Allen, it is ordered that Andrew M. Morrissey, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Little, it is ordered that [illegible], Esquire, of Escondido, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter G. Gerry, it is ordered that Albert A. Baker, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, it is ordered that John G. Swearingen, Esquire, of Bartow, and Van C. Swearingen, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Taylor, it is ordered that William C. Rigby, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that William J. Bruell, Esquire, of Redfield, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Victor I. Minahan, it is ordered that Eben R. Minahan, Esquire, of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Kirby, it is ordered that J. C. Marshall, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Oliver B. Saalfield, Administrator of John Hamilton Brown, deceased, Surviving Claimant of John H. Brown and Harvey H. Munsell, Trustees, Appellant,
101. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Byron S. Waite, Israel F. Fischer, and Henderson M. Somerville, as General Appraisers, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as the Board of Tea Appeals, Appellants,
353. vs.
George H. Macy, Oliver C. Macy, George S. Clapp, T. Ridgway Macy, and Irving K. Hall, doing business as copartners under the name of Carter, Macy & Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

2 Orig.ˡ Commonwealth of Virginia,
vs. Complainant,
State of West Virginia.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket to be heard at the next term after the February Recess, on the questions indicated in the closing paragraph of the opinion this day delivered, subject to all the limitations and restrictions in such opinion contained.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

335. Donald A. Curran,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Chicago Short Line Railway Company.

In Error to the Appellate Court, First District, of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court, First District, of the State of Illinois, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward B. Pryor and Edward F. Kearney, Receivers of the Wabash Railroad Company,
495. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Laura Christy, Administratrix of the Estate of Edward F. Christy, deceased.

In Error to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George F. Montgomery,
799. vs. Appellant,
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

650. Clarence F. Birdseye,
Appellant,
vs.
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

651. Kellogg Birdseye,
Appellant,
vs.
Arthur Woods, Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here-ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

610. Citizens Bank of Michigan City, Indiana,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Opperman.

On consideration of the suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein under Rule 14, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

862. The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Alvin Hill.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

877. The United States of America,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
C. T. Doremus.

W. S. Webb and Jacob Goldbaum,
883. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al.
693. vs. Appellants,
John M. Landon, as Receiver etc.

Kansas City, Missouri, et al.,
816. vs. Appellants,
John M. Landon, Receiver etc., et al.

Kansas City Gas Company et al.
817. vs. Appellants,
Kansas Natural Gas Company, John M. Landon et al.,
Receivers, et al.

The Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al.
856. vs. Appellants,
John M. Landon, as Receiver etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Erik Sandberg, Carl Jansen,
J. A. Benjaminsen and John
Peranen,
935. vs. Petitioners,
John McDonald, Claimant of
the British Ship "Talus."

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the

Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, with Case No. 868.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Liverpool, Brazil & River Plate Steam Navigation Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

610. Citizens Bank of Michigan City, Indiana, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mary Opperman.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York Central Railroad Company and The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioners,
921. vs.
The City of Chicago.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel ~~thereupon had as well~~ in support of ~~the~~ ~~against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company and Sheffield Car Company, Petitioners,
922. vs.
American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Isaac Sanger, Alex Sanger and Cornelius Sanger, surviving members of the copartnership of Sanger Brothers, and J. Robinson, Trustee etc.,
927. vs. Petitioners,
Sarah Catherine Woodward.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mariano Lim,
933. vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

939.

C. T. Dashiell, Trustee, et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Lewis T. Fitzhugh, Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Busch-Grace
Produce Company.

On petition for writ of
Certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Sixth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel ~~thereupon had, as well~~ in support of ~~or against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

949.

Rederiaktiebolaget Amie,
vs. Petitioner,
Universal Transportation
Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of
Certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Second
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

952. The United States of America, Petitioner,
vs.
Henry Veeder.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

962. Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Petitioner,
vs.
The First-Second National Bank of Pittsburgh et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

963. James B. Harris, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of

The Arkadelphia Milling Company
353. vs. Appellant,
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al.

……

John F. Hardy et al.,
354. vs. Appellants,
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al.

……

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company et al.,
355. vs. Appellants,
The Southern Cotton Oil Company.

……

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al.,
356. vs. Appellants,
The Southern Cotton Oil Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motions to dismiss in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cases on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Candelaria Cordova,
372. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Walter B. Grant, Sole Executor etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
387. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Territory of Alaska.

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
388. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Territory of Alaska.

Alaska Salmon Company,
442. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Territory of Alaska.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motions to dismiss in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cases on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Bank of Oxford et al.,
260. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
J. S. Love et al., Bank Examiners of the State of Mississippi.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for oral argument.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Emanuel Baltzer et al.,
797. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.
&
William J. Head,
798. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

954. General Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. Cooper Hewitt Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope in behalf of Mr. John C. Pennie, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas B. Kerr and Mr. Parker W. Page, for the respondent.

11. Hitchman Coal & Coke Company, Petitioner, vs. John Mitchell, individually, et al.

On motion of Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the petitioner, leave is hereby granted to withdraw the contempt proceedings herein.

932. The Filer & Stowell Company, Petitioner, vs. Diamond Iron Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William D. Henderson, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank N. Whitley, for the respondent.

590. Supreme Conclave, Improved Order of Heptasophs, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Marshall Wilson.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this case, or to place the cause on the summary docket, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Matthew N. [illegible] for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, with leave to counsel for plaintiff in error to file brief in

949. George Stuart, as Trustee etc.,
vs. Petitioner,
Estelle Marquez Bowen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. William M. Williams in behalf of Mr. Gustave F. Mertens and Mr. Benjamin P. Drum for the petitioner.

950. The Biggs-Forbes Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Carl R. Mayo.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of Mr. Henry G. Head, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Newton Nance Lassiter, for the respondent.

28 Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of
Northwestern Surety Insurance
Company,
Petitioner

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Colladay, in behalf of Mr. Hayden Johnson and Mr. Thomas M. Fields, for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. Randolph Hicks, for the respondent.

984. Redpath Lyceum Bureau,
vs. Petitioner,
John L. Pickering, Collector
of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Victor Elting and Mr. Albert M. Stokes, for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief on or before Thursday next.

Compagnie de Commerce et de Navigation d'Extrême Orient,
960. vs. Petitioner,
Hamburg-Amerika Packetfahrt Actiengesellschaft.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. Evans Browne and Mr. W. A. Kincaid, for the petitioner.

Jennie Lathrop (P) Rand,
544. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari, and the motion to remand for additional findings of fact, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. L. Fishback and Mr. H. T. Newcomb, for the appellant.

William H. Miner,
170. vs. Petitioner,
The T. H. Symington Company.
and
The T. H. Symington Company,
226. vs. Petitioner,
The National Malleable Castings Company et al.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Gilbert P. Ritter, for the respondent in No. 170, and concluded by Mr. Charles Neave, for the respondents in No. 226.

Monday, April 22, 1918, Continued.

173. Pittsburgh Melting Company,
vs. Appellant,
G. E. Totten, Inspector of the
Bureau of Animal Industry etc.

This cause was argued by
Mr. Samuel McClay, of
Counsel for the appellant,
and by Mr. Assistant
Attorney General Frierson, of
Counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 23, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. C. Lyon, it is ordered that Ralph Pring, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, it is ordered that Stuart E. Knappen and Charles F. Hext, Esquires, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. [illegible], it is ordered that John [illegible]

Easton, Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben C. Hilliard, it is ordered that W. D. Milligan, Esquire, of Guthrie Center, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that William Sea, Junior, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Louis P. Donovan, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Hagerman, it is ordered that John R. Waller, Esquire, of Dubuque, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sub.	Erie Railroad Company, vs. Petitioner, Edwin J. Hilt, Junior, an infant, by his next friend etc.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and it is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday the twenty-ninth instant.

266. Abe Danciger et al., doing business as Danciger Brothers,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. G. Cooley.

On motion of Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term.

271. Associated Billposters and Distributors of the United States and Canada et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

256. Mrs. Laura L. Burns,
vs. Petitioner,
J. S. Maloney, as Trustee etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. William E. Hemingway, for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. S. Wimberly, for the respondent.

257. J. F. Shepard et al.,
vs. Appellants,
James M. Barkley, Moderator of the General Assembly, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Morrow, of counsel for the appellants, and by Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellees.

257.	W. E. Ross & Company, Incorporated, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Emerson C. Harrington, Governor of the State of Maryland, et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George Whitelock, for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, April 24, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Robert N. Miller, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, and Arthur A. Ballantine, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. J. M. [illegible], it is ordered that James M. Oliver, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and Edward C. Plummer, Esquire, of Bath, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Baldwin, it is ordered that Herman S. Fay, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry S. Robbins, it is ordered that N. Ware Barnum, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that Sam R. Marks, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

478. Mary A. Parmelee, as Administratrix etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The motion to affirm or transfer this cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. W. Dines in behalf of Mr. Herman H. Field, for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin and Mr. Thomas B. McMartin, for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

904. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Alabama.

Mr. William H. Williams, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

259. D. E. Foote & Company, Inc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Emerson C. Harrington, Governor of the State of Maryland, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George Whitelock, for the plaintiffs in error, by Mr. Ogle Marbury, for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. George Whitelock, for the plaintiffs in error.

261. Fernand Vaughan Sargent, Appellant, vs. Charles Payne Fenner, Testamentary Executor, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Winans Wall, for the appellant, continued by Mr. George Denegre for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. G. T. Fitzhugh, for the appellant.

263. The Chicago, Kalamazoo & Saginaw Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Gale Kindlesparker.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Stuart E. Knappen, for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Edward F. Hart, for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at

Thursday, April 25, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Brandegee, it is ordered that Edwin D. Worcester, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Ralph Burton, it is ordered that Wood B. Carrington, Esquire, of Waco, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that T. R. Hood, Esquire, and [illegible] M. [illegible], Esquire, of [illegible], State of Tennessee, of Gadsden, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. E. Richardson, it is ordered that Albert Bettis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

833. Robert Cox, Appellant,
vs.
Major General Leonard Wood, Commandant of Camp Funston in the State of Kansas.

Mr. Thomas Taylor, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file petition for rule to punish for contempt in this cause.

278. Joseph Noel et al., Appellants,
vs.
Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

263. The Chicago, Kalamazoo & Saginaw Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Jake Kindlesparker.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. [illegible] for the defendant in error, and continued by Mr. [illegible] Knappen, for the plaintiff in error.

Thursday, April 25th, 1918, continued.

263.	B. M. Adams, vs. Plaintiff in Error, W. S. Kingsbury, as Register of the State Land Office.	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. R. P. Henshall, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb, for the defendant in error.
267.	Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum, vs. Petitioner, Sue B. Behrend.	This cause was argued by Mr. Howard C. Wiggins, for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner, for the respondent.
270.	John H. Friederichsen, vs. Petitioner, G. H. Renard, as Executor etc., et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William V. Allen, for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. R. E. Evans, for the respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, April 26th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Cummins, it is ordered that [illegible] W. Call, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Shields, it is ordered that John H. DeWitt, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Friday, April 26th, 1918, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis it is ordered that B. I. Litowich, Esquire, of Salina, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Jessie Lathrop Read,
[illegible] vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, for the appellee, leave is hereby granted to file brief in opposition to motion for writ of certiorari and motion to remand for additional findings of facts.

Wells Fargo & Company,
219. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Nevada.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

G. L. Henderson et al.,
282. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Nellie R. Bassor, or Nellie R. Henderson, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

John W. Hinrichsen,
270. vs. Petitioner,
G. H. Renner, as Executor etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. E. Evans, for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. William V. Allen, for the petitioner.

133.	E. F. McGinnis et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The People of the State of California.	These causes were argued by Mr. William [illegible], Junior, for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. James M. [illegible] for the defendants in error.
134.	E. F. McGinnis et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The People of the State of California.	
272.	Grinnell Washing Machine Company, vs. Petitioner, E. E. Johnson Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Melville Church, for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 29th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank Key Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Daniel Ney Dougherty, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that Morton K. Yonts, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. A. Milliken, it is ordered that Clinton L. Parker and

Joseph Martin, Esquire, of Green Bay, and Edward J. [illegible], Esquire, of Milwaukee, Harry R. [illegible], Esquire, of Marinette, State of Wisconsin, and Michael J. Doyle, Esquire, of Menominee, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Becker, it is ordered that Richard Kelly, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Connolly, it is ordered that George W. [illegible], Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, it is ordered that Frank Evans, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that James W. [illegible], Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, it is ordered that Henry Johns Gibbons and Henry John Nelson, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Q. Tracy, it is ordered that Robert S. Erskine, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex rel. Louisville Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
70. vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions that a writ of mandamus issue to the Commission directing that it proceed to dispose of the claim in controversy under the construction placed upon its jurisdiction by the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Jacob M. Dickinson, as Receiver
of the Chicago, Rock Island &
Pacific Railway Company,
735. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
George C. Stiles.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of the
State of
Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. H. Emery & Company,
739. vs. Appellant,
American Refrigerator
Transit Company.

Appeal from the District Court
of the United States for the
Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

230.	Jose Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet and Joaquin Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet, vs. Appellants, The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation.	Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

231.	Joaquin Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet, Jose Ibanez de Aldecoa y Palet, and Isabel Palet y Gabarro, vs. Appellants, Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation.	Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

D. E. Foote & Company, Inc., etc.,
259. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Emerson C. Harrington, Governor of the State of Maryland, Hugh A. McMullen, Comptroller of the State of Maryland, and John M. Dennis, Treasurer of the State of Maryland.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chicago, Kalamazoo & Saginaw Railway Company,
263. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Gale Kindlesparker.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered & adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

236.	Mrs. Laura L. Bunch, vs. Petitioner, J. T. Maloney, as Trustee in Bankruptcy for the T. H. Bunch Commission Company.	On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

478.	Mary A. Parmelee, as Administratrix of the Estate of David Parmelee, deceased, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

In re Albert Marche de Ruppert.

On consideration of the petition filed herein by the Solicitor General,

It is now here ordered by the Court that Charles W. Needham, Frederic D. McKenney, and Melville Church, Esquires, be, and they are hereby, appointed a Committee of the Bar to investigate, and, if so advised, to prepare and file charges against Albert Marche de Ruppert with the view to striking his name from the roll of attorneys permitted to practice before this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Portsmouth Harbor Land and Hotel Company et al.
905. vs. Appellants,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to remand for further findings in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jennie Lathrop Rame,
544. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion for writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record and the motion to remand for further findings in this cause be, and the same are hereby, postponed to the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 29th, 1918, Continued.

Paul Nielsen et al.,
936. vs. Petitioners,
Rhine Shipping Company, Claimant
of the Sailing Ship Rhine.

~~~~

John Hardy et al.,
937. vs. Petitioners,
Shepard & Morse Lumber Company,
Claimant of the Barkentine "Windrush".

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument with cases Nos. 868 and 935 on Monday, October 14th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Emanuel Baltzer, Gottfried Baltzer,
Pietrus Ternerschmidt et al.,
797. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.

~~~~

William J. Head,
798. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

904. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Alabama.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

950. The Birge-Forbes Company, Petitioner, vs. Carl R. Heye.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

932. The Fiss & Stowell Company, Petitioner, vs. Diamond Iron Works.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

734. General Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. Cooper Hewitt Electric Company.
On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

760. Compagnie de Commerce et de Navigation d'Extreme Orient, Petitioner, vs. The Hamburg-Amerika Packetfahrt Aktiengesellschaft.
On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 29th 1918, Continued.

965.	George Stuart, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of George Manegold, Petitioner, vs. Estelle Manegold Brown.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

984.	Redpath Lyceum Bureau, Petitioner, vs. John L. Pickering, Collector of Internal Revenue.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 3d, and that the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 6th, to Monday, May 20th. No petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May 6th.

1003. Ex parte Lloyd N. Duncan, Petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Lloyd N. Duncan, the petitioner, pro se.

352. Louis H. Perlman, Appellant and Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Fulton M. Brylawski, in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to file a supplemental brief in behalf of the appellant and plaintiff in error.

972. Julian N. Evrard, Claimant etc., Petitioner, vs. Eugene Higgins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Stewart Davison, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Selden Bacon, for the respondent.

[illegible]. Fifth National Bank of the City of New York, Petitioner, vs. John L. Lyttle, as Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Beecher, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irving L. Ernst, for the respondent.

924.
Great Bear Spring Company
vs. Petitioner,
Bear Lithia Springs Company.
and

925.
Fulton Water Works Company
vs. Petitioner,
Bear Lithia Springs Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari in these causes to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edmund J. Beach, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Fritz v. Briesen, for the respondent.

974.
W. J. Carroll,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. B. Beach, in behalf of Mr. William H. Atwell, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fitts, for the respondent.

469.
Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,
vs. Appellant,
City of Richmond.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George Wayne Anderson, in behalf of Mr. H. R. Pollard, for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. John A. [illegible], Junior, for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Company, Inc.,
and Albert [illegible],
969. vs. Petitioners,
[illegible] Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John M. Coleman, in behalf of Mr. William B. Brice, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles M. [illegible], for the respondent.

James Flagg,
973. vs. Petitioner,
Ellsworth E. Cook.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John M. Coleman, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gilbert E. Roe, for the respondent.

National Bank of Bakersfield,
981. vs. Petitioner,
William H. Moore, Junior, as
Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton, in behalf of Mr. William J. Hunsaker, and Mr. E. W. Britt, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lynn Helm, for the respondent.

Cherokee Oil & Gas Company,
972. vs. Petitioner,
Charles L. [illegible], et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, in behalf of Mr. [illegible], Mr. Russell [illegible], Mr. W. P. Thompson and Mr. W. [illegible] for the Petitioner.

956.
R. A. Graham, Petitioner,
vs.
J. D. Spreckels & Brothers Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. F. Dunne, for the respondent.

471.
Rust Land & Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ed. Jackson et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. D. Drayton, in behalf of Mr. Marcellus Green and Mr. Garner Wynn Green, for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Herbert Pope for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

942.
[illegible], Petitioner,
vs.
[illegible] et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon and Mr. Jeremiah F. Sullivan, for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Kelly for the respondents.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company,
990. vs. Petitioner,
[illegible] Petrowsky, an infant etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Austin J. McMahon and Mr. W. S. Jenney, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Baltrus S. Yankaus, for the respondent.

[illegible] Mines Company,
993. vs. Petitioner,
Bertha D. [illegible], Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Rigby, Mr. John S. Miller and Mr. Benjamin F. Niles, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney and Mr. Roger Sherman, for the respondent.

James C. [illegible] et al.,
935. vs. Petitioners,
James A. Chapman et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. Edward Wright, in behalf of Mr. Lewis C. Lawson and Mr. James C. Davis, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harry W. Rogers for the respondent.

Louis Heller et al.
963. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of New Mexico on the relation
of the Northwestern Colonization & Improvement

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James R. Garfield, Mr. W. J. [illegible], Mr. Henry P. [illegible] and Mr. Francis C. Wilson, for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Walter D. [illegible], Mr. Samuel T. Holmes, Mr. A. B. Renehan and Mr. Charles A. Douglas, for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

988. Camp Bird, Limited, Petitioner, vs. Frank W. Howbert, as Collector of Internal Revenue etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. A. A. Hedding, Junior, in behalf of Mr. William V. Hodges and Mr. George L. Nye, for the petitioners.

272. Grinnell Washing Machine Company, Petitioner, vs. E. E. Johnson Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Melville Church, for the petitioner, by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope, for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Melville Church, for the petitioner.

31 Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Hassan Abdu et al., Petitioners.

This cause was argued by Mr. Silas B. Axtell, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert S. Erskine, for the respondent.

Western Union Telegraph
Company et al.
274. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Calvin H. Foster et al. etc.

Western Union Telegraph
Company et al.,
275. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Frederick J. McCord et al. etc.

Henry G. S. Noble, as President
of the New York Stock Exchange,
419. vs. Appellant,
The Western Union Telegraph
Company et al.

and

Henry G. S. Noble, as President
of the New York Stock Exchange,
420. vs. Appellant,
The United Telegram Company
et al.

It is ordered by the Court that one hour additional time be allowed for the argument of these causes.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Robbins, of counsel for the appellant in Nos. 419 and 420.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 30th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, it is ordered that Arthur M. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that John G. Price, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Chicago Bonding and Surety
Company,
809. vs. Petitioner,
Augusta-Savannah Navigation
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles B. Stafford, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harrison Musgrave and Mr. William S. Oppenheim, for the respondent.

Western Union Telegraph Company et al.,
274. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Calvin H. Foster et al. etc.

Western Union Telegraph Company et al.,
275. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Frederick J. McLeod et al. etc.

Henry G. S. Noble, as President of the
New York Stock Exchange,
419. vs. Appellant,
The Western Union Telegraph Company et al.
&

Henry G. S. Noble, as President of the
New York Stock Exchange,
420. vs. Appellant,
The United Telegram Company et al.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Henry S. Robbins, for the appellant in Nos. 419 and 420, by Mr. Rush Taggart, for the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 274 and 275; by Mr. Patrick Henry Kelley, for Calvin H. Foster; by Mr. H. Ware Barnum, for the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, and concluded by Mr. John G. Milburn, for the plaintiff in error in Nos. 274 and 275.

Tuesday, April 30th, 1918, continued.

276.	The New Orleans and Northeastern Railroad Company et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Cheney Harris, Administratrix etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted on printed

argument by Mr. Thomas G. Fewell, for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, May 1st, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, it is ordered that Ernest G. Cleve, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Little, it is ordered that J. F. Railsback, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, May 1st, 1918. Continued.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. John A. Garrett, it is ordered that Edward A. Biggs, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

238. The United States, Appellant,
vs.
Walter Ferguson et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, for the appellant, and by Mr. Harry H. Rogers, Mr. Joseph L. Hull and Mr. Nathan H. Gibson, for the appellees.

277 & Exploration Company, Limited, et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry McAllister, Junior, for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful, for the appellee.

281. Lottie Carney, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. C. Chapman et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Kirby Fitzpatrick, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. C. Duncan, for the defendant in error.

203.	Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James B. Sheean for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, May 2nd, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampton L. Carson, it is ordered that Joseph Carson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Foley, it is ordered that Robert L. [illegible], Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, it is ordered that Joseph E. Fleming, Esquire, of Poteau, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Dillyman, it is ordered that Dorothea E. S. Schunck, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
Railway Company et al.,
283. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Minneapolis Civic and Commerce
Association.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James B. Sheean, for the plaintiffs in error, by Mr. Frank J. Morley, for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. O. W. Dynes, for the plaintiffs in error.

International News Service,
568. vs. Petitioner,
The Associated Press.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel Untermyer, of Counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12.30 o'clock.

Friday, May 3^d^, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that John B. Bailey, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, and Charles A. Reynolds, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Untermyer, it is ordered that Charles S. Aronstam, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Russell, it is ordered that W. E. [illegible], Esquire, Millersburg, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clay, it is ordered that A. R. Burnam, Junior, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Raines, it is ordered that Leonard E. Lyke, Esquire, of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank P. Walsh, it is ordered that Louis S. Irvin, Esquire, of Glacier Park, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter Goelet Gerry, it is ordered that John P. Hartigan, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

221. International News Service, Petitioner, vs. The Associated Press.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Samuel Untermyer, for the petitioner, by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, for the petitioner.

846. Erie Railroad Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Edwin G. Hilt, Junior,
An infant etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Raymond Dawson, for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, May 6th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that George B. Francis, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, and Jacob Wasserman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupré, it is ordered that Edmond John Jacquet, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, May 6th, 1918, Continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Connolly, it is ordered that Thornton M. Pratt, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Blair, it is ordered that Clyde O. Garrett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, it is ordered that George R. Shields, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Hastings, it is ordered that Wesley E. Disney, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. C. Smith, it is ordered that William B. Simmons, Esquire, of Hillsdale, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther M. Walter, it is ordered that William Ellis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles T. Mickey, it is ordered that Edward M. Hammond, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

	Armand Vaughan Jasquet	Appeal from the District
261.	vs. Appellant,	Court of the United
	Charles Payne Fenner, Testamentary	States for the Eastern
	Executor, et al.	District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Chief Justice White took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

	Louis H. Perlman,	Appeal from and In Error to
702.	vs. Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,	the District Court of the
	The United States of America.	United States for the
		Southern District of New
		York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

J. F. Shepard, N. Logan,
W. H. Billings et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
James M. Barkley, Moderator of the General Assembly and Chairman of the Executive Commission of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, et al.

257.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

858.	Robert Cox, vs. Appellant, Major General Leonard Wood, Commandant of Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

869.	Luis Muller, William J. Cox, S. Lindauer, et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The State of New Mexico on the relation of the Northwestern Colonization & Improvement Company of Chihuahua.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor of the
State of Oklahoma, and N. M.
Freas, as Sheriff of Osage County,
Oklahoma,
245. vs. Appellants,
Gipsy Oil Company.

Appeal from the
District Court of the
United States for the
Western District of
Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor of the
State of Oklahoma, and N. M.
Freas, Sheriff of Osage County,
Oklahoma,
246. vs. Appellants,
Indian Territory Illuminating
Oil Company.

Appeal from the
District Court of the
United States for the
Western District of
Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, James Wooley, as Sheriff of Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and Lon Wilson, as Sheriff of Creek County, Oklahoma,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.
247. vs. Appellants,	
The Okla Oil Company.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. B. Howard, as Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, and H. M. Freas, as Sheriff of Osage County, Oklahoma,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.
248. vs. Appellants,	
Barnsdall Oil Company.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,
469. vs. Appellant.
City of Richmond.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause &c, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rust Land & Lumber Company,
471. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ed. Jackson et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause &c, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Robert Cox,
833. vs. Appellant,
Major General Leonard Wood, Commandant of Camp Funston in the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a rule to show cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., and William F. Gray,
957. vs. Petitioners,
Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as substituted trustee of Stephen A. C. Ball et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

924. Great Bear Spring Company vs. Petitioner, Bear Lithia Springs Company. On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

925. Fulton Water Works Company, vs. Petitioner, Bear Lithia Springs Company. On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

938.	James C. Chupco, Toney Chupco, Joseph Chupco, et al., vs. Petitioners, James A. Chapman et al.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

942.	Isabelle Garwood, vs. Petitioner, Joseph Scheiber, Morris Scheiber, and John Scheiber.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

943.	[illegible] Mines Company, vs. Petitioner, Bertha D. Baur, Administratrix with the will annexed of the Estate of Jacob Baur, deceased.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

948. First National Bank of the City of New York, Petitioner, vs. John L. Lyttle, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Wells & Marvin Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

951. National Bank of Bakersfield, Petitioner, vs. William H. Moore, Jr., as Trustee of the Estate of Alfred W. Bannister, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support or as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

956.

R. A. Graham,
Petitioner,
vs.
The J. D. Spreckels & Brothers Company and Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

966.

Vulcan Metals Company, Inc., and Albert Freeman,
Petitioners,
vs.
Simmons Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

973. [illegible] Oil & Gas Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles L. Melton, Addie H. Melton, C. E. Slogenhop et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

974. W. J. Carrell, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

975. Isaac Flagg, Petitioner, vs. Ellsworth E. Cook.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1000. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Ignatz Petrowsky, an infant, by Ona Rodin, his guardian ad litem.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1002. Ex parte Lloyd H. Duncan, Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago Bonding & Surety Company,
1004. vs. Petitioner,
Augusta-Savannah Navigation Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

The Reporter having represented that, owing to the number of decisions at the present term, it would be impracticable to put the reports in one volume,

It is, therefore, now here ordered that he publish an additional volume in this year pursuant to Section 226 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clinton H. Pierce, Angelo Creo, Charles F. Zeilman and Charles Nelson,
1022. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States District Court,
Northern District of New York.

United States of America
vs.
Clinton H. Pierce, [illegible],
Charles Z. Zeilman and [illegible].

Criminal No. 1350.

Northern District of New York, ss:

I, William S. Doolittle, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York do hereby certify that in the above entitled case a writ of error from the Supreme Court to this Court was sued out by the defendants above-named, duly allowed by the Honorable George W. Ray, District Judge and issued on the 14th day of December, 1917, judgment having been entered and record of conviction filed in said case in the said District Court on the 17th day of November, 1917.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said District Court this 8th day of April, A.D. 1918, and of the Independence of these United States the one hundred forty-second.

< Seal >

<Signed> W. S. Doolittle
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiffs in error have failed to have their cause docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Minnie A. Rankin and
Alexander C. Rankin,
1010. vs. Petitioners,
Charles Frederick Graff and
Emily B. Graff.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Graham, for the petitioners.

Joseph L. Lackner, Administrator &c.,
1007. vs. Petitioner,
John S. Miller and Merritt Starr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Manierre, for the respondent.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway
Company,
990. vs. Petitioner,
F. E. Gunke.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. R. A. Van Doren and Mr. William T. Wheeler, for the petitioners.

976.
William Schall, Jr., et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Frederick Camors et al.,
Trustees etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Blair, in behalf of Mr. Ralph S. Rounds, for the petitioners.

70.
The United States ex rel.
Louisville Cement Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On motion of Mr. George M. Lamar, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered by the Court that the mandate issue in this cause.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 20th, 1918, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, May 20th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Royall R. Watkins, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, and B. F. Shipman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that Robert F. Spragins, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel V. Hayden, it is ordered that Francis B. Allen, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and Joseph A. Burkart, Junior, and James R. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Dyer, it is ordered that Richard F. Ralph, Esquire, of Clayton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, it is ordered that W. Martin Jones, Junior, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, it is ordered that Francis S. McIlhenny, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, it is ordered that [illegible] Palmer, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe T. Robinson, it is ordered that G. S. May, Esquire, of Benton, John W. Newman, Esquire, of Little Rock and B. R. Davidson, Esquire, of Fayetteville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, it is ordered that Delger Trowbridge, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, it is ordered that Richard E. Babcock, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Felix E. Porter, Esquire, of Ancon, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that Edward E. Sapp, Esquire, of Galena, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Stafford, it is ordered that Theodore P. Wilsohen, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, and Frank T. Boesel, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles N. Bates, it is ordered that [illegible] B. [illegible], Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Neal Power, it is ordered that George J. Welch, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, it is ordered that George Vaux, Junior, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isidor B. Dockweiler, it is ordered that John F. Davis, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, it is ordered that James R. Armstrong, Esquire, of Hugo, and David D. Brunson, Esquire, of Coalgate, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Raker, it is ordered that W. B. Rinehart, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Kahn, it is ordered that C. W. Milton, Esquire, of Dodge City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

270.	John F. Friederichsen, Petitioner, vs. F. H. Renard, as Executor of the Estate of Edward Renard, deceased, et al.	On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska in this cause be, and the same are hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

B. F. Looney, Attorney General, and Luther Nickels, Assistant Attorney General, of the State of Texas,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.
756. vs. Appellants,	
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,	In Error to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.
623. vs. Plaintiff in Error,	
L. A. Laughlin.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

600. Chicago & Alton Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; ~~and~~ that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

574. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Clark H. Rice. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Emanuel J. Doyle, Collector of Internal Revenue,
492. vs. Petitioner,
Mitchell Brothers Company.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

J. A. Hays, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of West Virginia,
327. vs. Petitioner,
The Gauley Mountain Coal Company.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States of America,	On writ of Certiorari to
698. vs. Petitioner,	the United States Circuit
The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago	Court of Appeals for the
& St. Louis Railway Company.	Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

W. A. Marin, as Receiver of the American Biscuit Company of Crookston,
Plaintiff in Error,
227. vs.
Ole J. Augedahl.

In Error to the District Court of Cass County, State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Cass County, State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Justice Pitney
and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

William E. Peck & Company, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in Error,
234. vs.
John Z. Lowe, Jr., Collector of Internal Revenue, Second District of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

235. The United States, Appellant, vs. Walter Ferguson, T. A. Manwarring, A. H. Hatch et al. | Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

516. The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Biwabik Mining Company. | On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Goldfield Consolidated Mines Company,
334. vs.
Joseph J. Scott, as Collector of U. S. Internal Revenue, First California District.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first and second questions certified must be answered in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company,
240. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Wisconsin.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the

record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Erie Railroad Company,
Sub. vs. Petitioner,
Edwin J. Hilt, Jr., an infant, by his next friend, and Edwin J. Hilt, Sr.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes,

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Lottie Carney,
281. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. C. Chapman, Dennis Alberson,
Nina Alberson, et al.

In Error to
Court of the
Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcri
record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklaho
was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof,
here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the jud
the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the
hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Western Union Telegraph Company
and United Telegram Company,
274. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Calvin H. Foster and Frederick J.
Macleod et al., Members of the
Public Service Commission of Massachusetts.

In E
Sup
Court
of M

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of t
the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts,
gued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now
and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said
Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby,
costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby,
said Supreme Judicial Court for further proceedings not
with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Western Union Telegraph Company
and United Telegraph Company,
578. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Frederick J. Macleod et al. Constituting
the Public Service Commission of the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Error to the Supreme
Judicial Court of the State
of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Judicial Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Henry G. S. Noble, as President of the
New York Stock Exchange,
619. vs. Appellant,
The Western Union Telegraph Company,
Calvin H. Foster, et al.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United States
for the District of
Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Henry G. S. Noble, as President of the New York Stock Exchange, 120. vs. Appellant, The United Telegram Company, Calvin H. Foster, et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States, 207. vs. Appellant, United Shoe Machinery Company of New Jersey, et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Clarke.
(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

C. F. McGinis and E. E. Young, Plaintiffs in Error,
133. vs.
The People of the State of California.

In Error to the Superior Court of Imperial County, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Imperial County, State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

C. F. McGinis and E. E. Young, Plaintiffs in Error,
134. vs.
The People of the State of California.

In Error to the Superior Court of Imperial County, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court in Imperial County, State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex parte: In the matter of Southwestern Surety Insurance Company, Petitioner.

28 Orig.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition, the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

200.

York Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
V. B. Colley et al.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals of the Fourth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals of the Fourth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil

Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Circuit Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Pitney.

Ex parte In the matter of Hassan Abdu et al. Petitioners. 31 Orig.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus, the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

656.
Fort Smith & Western Railroad Company and Superior Savings & Trust Company, Trustee,
Appellants,
vs.
Arthur L. Mills, Receiver of the Fort Smith & Western Railroad Company, and J. Virgil Bourland, U. S. District Attorney.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

The attention of counsel is directed (a) to the clause of the Army Appropriation Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645) authorizing the President in time of war to take possession and assume control of railroads; (b) to the Proclamation of the President of December 26, 1917, exerting the power conferred; (c) to the Act of March 21, 1918 (Public No. 107, 65th Congress) providing "for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes"; (d) to the Proclamation of the President of March 29, 1918, authorizing the Director General of Railroads to agree with carriers as to the amount of compensation to be paid. And they are requested to submit on or before the first day of the next term arguments upon the subject of how far, if at all, the legislation referred to and the action taken under it leave no issue in this case for judicial consideration; in other words, have caused the case to become wholly moot.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Supreme Conclave, Improved Order of Heptasophs,
870. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Marshall Wilson.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lucy S. Ayres, Executrix, etc.,
175. vs. Petitioner,
Benjamin F. Graham et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

988.	Camp Bird, Limited, vs. Petitioner, Frank W. Howbert, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Colorado.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

996.	William Schall, Jr., Carl Muller, Edmund Ravenstadt, and Frederick Muller Schall, vs. Petitioners, Frederick Camors et al., Trustees of the Bankrupt Estates of Albert Lemore, Bankrupt, and of Edward E. Carriere, Bankrupt.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

970. Julian N. Evans, Claimant of the Steam Yacht "[illegible]", Petitioner, vs. Eugene Higgins. — On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

990. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. F. E. Curtiss. — On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1007. Joseph L. Lackner, Administrator de bonis non with the will annexed of Frederick C. Weir, deceased, Petitioner, vs. John S. Miller & Daniel Street. — On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1010. Minnie A. Rankin and Alexander G. Rankin, Petitioners, vs. Charles Frederick Graff & Emily B. Graff.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of Counsel ~~thereupon had, as well~~ in support of ~~as against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn for the term on Monday, June 10th next.

1 Orig. The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Tennessee Copper Company et al.

The petition of the Ducktown Sulphur Copper & Iron Company, a defendant herein, for a modification of the injunction was submitted to the consideration of the

Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in behalf of Mr. W. B. [illegible] for the appellant.

1 Orig.

The State of Georgia,
vs. Complainant,
The Tennessee Copper Company
et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, leave is hereby granted to file brief in behalf of the United States as *amicus curiae*, upon the petition for a modification of the injunction decree, and to the Attorney General of the State of Georgia to file an opposition to the granting of the said petition.

1054.

William E. Sandberg
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"District Court of the United States,
For the District of Minnesota, Fourth Division.

I, Charles L. Spencer, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein The United States of America was plaintiff, and William E. Sandberg was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 10th day of October, A.D. 1917, against the said William E. Sandberg, and that on the 29th day of October, A.D. 1917, said William E. Sandberg sued out a writ of error to said District Court, desiring to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe
my name and affix the seal of said District
< Seal > Court at Minneapolis, Minnesota, this 11th
day of May, A.D. 1918.
< Signed > Charles L. Spencer,
Clerk."

moves the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] George A. [illegible],
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"District Court of the United States,
For the District of Minnesota, Fourth Division.

I, Charles L. Spencer, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein The United States of America was plaintiff, and George A. [illegible] was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 10th day of October, A.D. 1917, against the said George A. [illegible], and that on the 29th day of October, A. D. 1917, said George A. [illegible] sued out a writ of error to said District Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe
(Seal) my name and affix the seal of said District
Court, at Minneapolis, Minnesota, this 11th
day of May, A. D. 1918.
(Signed) Charles L. Spencer,
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have this cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1056.
Axel C. Mattson,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"District Court of the United States,
For the District of Minnesota, Fourth Division.

I, Charles L. Spencer, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein The United States of America was plaintiff and Axel C. Mattson was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 10th day of October, A.D. 1917, against the said Axel C. Mattson, and that on the 29th day of October, A.D. 1917, said Axel C. Mattson sued out a writ of error to said District Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name
(Seal) and affix the seal of the said District Court at
Minneapolis, Minnesota, this 11th day of May,
A.D. 1918.

(Signed) Charles L. Spencer,
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule, And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; And that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1027. Ben Anderson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"District Court of the United States,
For the District of Minnesota, Fourth Division.

I, Charles L. Spencer, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein The United States of America was plaintiff, and Ben Anderson was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 10th day of October, A. D. 1917, against the said Ben Anderson, and that on the 29th day of October, A. D. 1917, said Ben Anderson sued out a writ of error to said District Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe
my name and affix the seal of said
<Seal> District Court, at Minneapolis, Minne-
sota, this 11th day of May, A. D. 1918.
<Signed> Charles L. Spencer,
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his case filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alfred Tiala.
[illegible] vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of Counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit;

"District Court of the United States,
For the District of Minnesota, Fourth Division.

I, Charles L. Spencer, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein the United States of America was plaintiff, and Alfred Tiala was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 10th day of October, A.D. 1917, against the said Alfred Tiala, and that on the 29th day of October, A.D. 1917, said Alfred Tiala sued out a writ of error to said District Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court, at Minneapolis, Minnesota this 11th day of May, A.D. 1918.

(Seal)

(Signed) Charles L. Spencer,
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District

Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1054. William A. Sandberg, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

1055. George A. Lauser, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

1056. Axel C. Mattson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

1057. Ben Anderson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

and

1058. Alfred Tiala, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to issue the mandates in these causes.

813. Donald Stephens, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry Budd for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

The First National Bank
of San Francisco et al.,
1013. vs. Petitioners,
Detroit Trust Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, Mr. W. E. Cushing and Mr. Charles S. Cushing, for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. Ham Thompson, for the respondents.

C. E. Wood, as Trustee etc.,
1001. vs. Petitioner,
Nick Rhoten et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Dennis Taylor, in behalf of Mr. Allan W. Cole, for the petitioner.

John A. Gesson et al.,
1005. vs. Petitioners,
F. G. Noyes, as Receiver etc.
and
R. C. Wood,
1006. vs. Petitioner,
F. G. Noyes, as Receiver etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, in behalf of Mr. W. H. Metson, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Geo. E. Rider, for the respondent.

Monday, May 20th, 1918. Continued.

D. W. Ryan Towing
Company (Inc.), Claimant etc.
1027. vs. Petitioner,
Bowers Southern Dredging
Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. John Charles Harris for the petitioner.

J. Cass Miller et al.
409. vs. Appellants,
John Wiethaupt et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Richard F. Ralph, in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Houts, for the appellees, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas K. Skinker, for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Owner and Claimant etc.,
1041. vs. Petitioner,
A. J. and J. J. McCollum, Inc.,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. [illegible] J. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. Joseph P. Nolan, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nelson Zabriskie, for the respondents.

Ben J. Hurst,
720. vs. Petitioner,
Cole Motor Car Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick J. [illegible], in behalf of Mr. M. M. Crane, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge and Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick, for the respondent.

979. Nancy Wharton Kirtley,
vs. Petitioner,
United States Trust Company
et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Joe V. Morgan, in behalf of Mr. W. Bourke Cockran, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward W. Sheldon and Mr. Charles B. [illegible] for the respondents.

1030. Cornelius O'Sullivan,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. S. B. Sutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the respondent.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of
George A. [illegible],
Petitioner.

Mr. Frank T. Boesel, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

1036. Sun Company et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Union Petroleum Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Francis J. McElhinny, in behalf of Mr. Alexander W. Smith and Mr. Victor Lamar Smith, for the petitioners, and by Mr. William D. Gordon and Mr. Arsène P. Pujo, for the respondent.

660\.
The Bank of California,
National Association,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Friend William Richardson,
as Treasurer of the State of
California.

Mr. Julius Kahn, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1039\.
The Union Pacific Coal
Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Mark A. Skinner, Collector
of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Junior, in behalf of Mr. Henry W. Clark, for the petitioner.

657\.
Peter Chelentis,
vs. Petitioner,
Luckenbach Steamship Company,
(Inc.).

Leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief for the respondent in this cause.

456\.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
vs. Petitioner.
Minnie Rosenfeld.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph M. Hayes, for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. J. Hughes, for the respondent.

1029. W. S. Rayburn,
vs. Petitioner,
John W. Lindley et al.
and
1030. Thomas Tipton,
vs. Petitioner,
John W. Lindley et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. E. Thomas, in behalf of Mr. Edward C. O'Rear, for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. R. Burnam, Junior, for the respondents.

991. B. S. Parker et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
The State of Arkansas ex rel.
Miss Thompson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Julian C. Wilson and Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward L. Westbrook, for the respondent.

985. Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Warren-Godwin Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton, in behalf of Mr. James N. Flowers, for the petitioner.

for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Francis J. McKenney, in behalf of Mr. Alexander W. Smith and Mr. Victor Lamar Smith, for the petitioners, and by Mr. William D. Gordon and Mr. Arsène P. Pujo, for the respondent.

660.
The Bank of California, National Association, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Friend William Richardson, as Treasurer of the State of California.

Mr. Julius Kahn, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1039.
The Union Pacific Coal Company, vs. Petitioner, Mark A. Skinner, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Junior, in behalf of Mr. Henry W. Clark, for the petitioner.

657.
Peter Chelentis, vs. Petitioner, Luckenbach Steamship Company, (Inc.).

Leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief for the respondent in this cause.

756.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company, vs. Petitioner, Minnie [illegible]

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph W. Keyes, for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. J. Hughes, for the respondent.

1019.	W. S. Raydure, vs. Petitioner, John W. Lindley et al. and	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. E. Thomas, in behalf of Mr. Edward C. O'Rear, for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. R. Burnam, Junior, for the respondents.
1020.	Thomas Tipton, vs. Petitioner, John W. Lindley et al.	

991.	R. S. Parker et al., vs. Petitioners, The State of Arkansas ex rel. Miss Thompson.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Julian

C. Wilson and Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward L. Westbrook, for the respondent.

985.	Postal Telegraph Cable Company, vs. Petitioner, Warren-Godwin Lumber Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was sub-

mitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Byrum C. Hinton, in behalf of Mr. James N. Flowers, for the petitioner.

Monday, May 20th, 1918, continued.

1021. The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as sole Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Great Shoshone & Twin Falls Water Power Company et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Oliver O. Haga, Mr. James H. Richards and Mr. Henry H. [illegible], for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. A. Walters for the respondents.

1025. Sun Company, Petitioner, vs. L. W. Ryan Towboat Company et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. J. Frank Staley, in behalf of Mr. John F. Lewis, for the petitioner.

973. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. W. M. Steele. The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Spalding Flannery in behalf of Mr. P. A. Willcox, Mr. F. L. [illegible] and Mr. H. E. Davis, for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Ragsdale, for the respondent.

Chicago House Wrecking Company,
932. vs. Petitioner,
West India Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, in behalf of Mr. Henry B. Gayley, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ferdinand E. M. Bullowa and Mr. Ralph James M. Bullowa, for the respondent.

Ajax Rail Anchor Company,
1040. vs. Petitioner,
The P & M Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, in behalf of Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Geo. B. Smith, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Rector, for the respondent.

Ajax Rail Anchor Company,
1040. vs. Petitioner,
The P & M Company.

On motion of Mr. George H. Howard in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file in this cause a statement of George S. Payson in behalf of certain railroads.

Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited,
1003. vs. Petitioner,
Clark-Montana Realty Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was

Submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh in behalf of Mr. W. W. Dixon, Mr. J. Bruce Kremer and Mr. William Scallon, for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Gray, for the respondents.

23 Orig. The State of Georgia, vs. Complainant, The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway and The Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. [illegible] B. Ellis, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to open and print the evidence in the case, for directing the filing of briefs, and for assignment of the cause for oral argument.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 3rd next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, June 3d, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Edward Marshall Surber, Adam B. Littlepage and S. C. Littlepage, Esquires, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, Frank M. Swacker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Owens Johnson, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Fitts, it is ordered that John L. Burnett, Esquire, of Gadsden, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 3d, 1918, Continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Graham, it is ordered that Charles J. Searle, Esquire, of Rock Island, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright, it is ordered that August L. Fourtner, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Clement E. Sutton, Esquire, of Washington, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Moon, it is ordered that J. T. Smith, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Antonio A. Sedillo, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, and A. Hall Johnston, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Buckner Clay, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that Charles E. Sauer, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that G. C. Nolk and Ellis Lewis Garretson, Esquires, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Salomon, it is ordered that Joseph Fairbanks, Esquire, of St. Johnsbury, State of Vermont, and Timothy J. Mahoney, Esquire, of Boone, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warren Crisler, it is ordered that Henry Ayres Uterhart and Alfred M. Schaffer, Esquires, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 3^d, 1918, Continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Robert Jerome Hull, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Adriaans, it is ordered that Thomas Philip Harrison, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

189.	The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error & Appellant, vs. The Government of the Philippine Islands.	In Error to and Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum,
267. vs. Petitioner,
Ida B. Behrend.

On writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Sunday Lake Iron Company,
38. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Township of Wakefield.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

190.	Jennetta J. McVey and John R. Caverly, as Executors of the Estate of William N. McVey, deceased, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Union Elevated Railroad Company, The Lake Street Elevated Railroad Company et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

276.	The New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Cheney Harris, Administratrix of the Estate of Van Harris, deceased.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

287. Peter Chelentis, Petitioner,
vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.
(Mr. Justice Holmes concurs in the result).

47. William A. Hartranft, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Alexander R. Mullowny, Judge of the Police Court of the District of Columbia.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

San Pedro, Los Angeles &
Salt Lake Railroad
Company,
48. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

In Error to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Ninth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

San Pedro, Los Angeles
& Salt Lake Railroad
Company,
48. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

On consideration of the petition
for a writ of certiorari
herein to the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Ninth Circuit, It is now
here ordered by this Court that
the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States,
75. vs. Appellant,
St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway Company and Great Northern Railway Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

United States Glue Company,
231. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Town of Oak Creek.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Milwaukee County, State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Milwaukee County, State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Chief Justice White concurs in the result).

Southern Pacific Company,
452. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John Z. Lowe Jr., United States
Collector of Internal Revenue for
the Second District of New York.

In Error to the District
Court of the United States
for the Southern District
of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

E. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal
Revenue for the District of
Minnesota,
422. vs. Petitioner,
H. C. Hornby.

On writ of Certiorari to the
United States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

708. Charles A. Peabody, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mark Eisner, Collector of Internal Revenue. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

22. Union Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld, State of Colorado, et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
22. vs. Appellant.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld, State of Colorado, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record filed on the appeal herein to stand as a return to said writ.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
22. vs. Appellant,
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld, State of Colorado, et al.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

mas A. Jefferson, Mattie R. Wesson,
t William Allison Jefferson, who was
y his guardian John A. Jefferson, Jr.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
. N. Fink and Ed Hart, as Administrators
the Estate of F. B. Severs, deceased, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from e Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged y this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this ause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

tate of Minnesota,
vs. Complainant,
ranklin K. Lane, Secretary
f the Interior, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and a motion of the defendants to dismiss said bill, which was argued by counsel.

n consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and creed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and e same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Monday, June 3d, 1918. Continued.

W. C. Hammer, United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, Appellant,
704. vs.
Roland H. Dagenhart, and Reuben Dagenhart and John Dagenhart, minors, by Roland H. Dagenhart, their next friend.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

26 Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Annie S. Simons, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and that the writ of mandamus as prayed for be, and the same is hereby, granted.

lice State Bank et al. Petitioners,
vs.
ouston Pasture Company.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record
om the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth
ircuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof,
t is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judg-
ent of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this
ause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that
is cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District
urt of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for
urther proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal
Revenue for the District of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
vs.
Henry Turrish.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record
rom the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof,
t is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment
f the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be,
nd the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be,
nd the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the
nited States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

r. Justice Brandeis & Mr. Justice Clarke concur in the result).

Donald Stephens
813. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company,
5. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

The United States,
6. vs. Appellant,
Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company.

Appeals from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided in opinion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of these causes).

Ex parte: In the matter of George B. [illegible], Petitioner. — Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, and The Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Company. [illegible] Orig.

On consideration of the joint motion of counsel for the respective parties to open and publish the testimony, to fix the dates for the filing of the respective briefs and assign the case for argument, It is now here ordered by the Court that the Clerk do open and cause to be printed the testimony and record in this case; that printed briefs of counsel be filed in the order and at the times as follows, to wit:

Brief of counsel for complainant to be filed on or before August 15th, 1918;

Brief in behalf of the defendants to be filed on or before October 1st, 1918;

Reply brief in behalf of complainant to be filed on or before five days preceding the date of argument;

Counsel for the respective parties may by mutual agreement change the time within which the respective briefs shall be filed, provided that all briefs shall be filed not later than five days preceding the date of the argument.

It is further ordered that this case be assigned for argument on Monday, October [illegible] next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The Bank of California,
National Association,
660. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Friend William Richardson,
as Treasurer of the State of
California.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October [illegible]th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,
985. vs. Petitioner,
Warren-Godwin Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry [illegible] [illegible],
989. vs. Petitioner,
United States Trust Company
and Morgan J. O'Brien, as
Executors and Trustees etc.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1037. The Union Pacific Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. Mark A. Skinner, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

920. Ben J. Tillar, Petitioner, vs. Cole Motor Car Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

973.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
W. M. Steele.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

986.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Minnie Rosenfeld.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

991.
B. S. Porter, A. B. Bartholomew, J. A. Crider, et al., Petitioners,
vs.
The State of Arkansas ex rel. Mike Thompson.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

C. L. Ward, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of F. W. McDaniel & Company and George [illegible], etc.,
1001. vs. Petitioners,
Kirk Brothers et al.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John A. [illegible], E. R. Peoples, James W. Hill et al.,
1006. vs. Petitioners,
F. G. Noyes, as Receiver of Washington-Alaska Bank.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

R. E. Wood,
1006. vs. Petitioner,
F. G. Noyes, as Receiver of
Washington-Alaska Bank.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The First National Bank
of San Francisco et al.
1013. vs. Petitioners,
Detroit Trust Company and
Alexander McPherson, as
Trustees, et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. D. Royster
1019. vs. Petitioner,
John W. Lindley et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the
United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thomas Tipton,
1020. vs. Petitioner,
John W. Lindley et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the
United States Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Equitable Trust Company of
New York, as sole Trustee etc.
et al., Petitioners,
1021. vs.
Great Shoshone & Twin Falls
Water Power Company et al.

On petition for writ of
Certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Ninth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon
support of as against the same, it is now here ordered
that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sun Company, | On petition for
1025. vs. Petitioner, | tiorari to the
D. W. Ryan Towboat Company | Circuit Court
and Bowers Southern Dredging | for the Fifth
Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certi
the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fi
of the argument of counsel in support of the same,
ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and
hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

D. W. Ryan Towboat Company, | On petition for
Inc., Claimant, etc. | tiorari to the
1027. vs. Petitioner, | Circuit Court
Bowers Southern Dredging Company | for the Fifth
et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certio
United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circ
argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now h
Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible],
1030. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari
to the United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for the Sixth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago House Wrecking Company
[illegible] vs. Petitioner,
West India Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sun Company & American Surety
Company of New York,
1034. vs. Petitioners,
Vinton Petroleum Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Fifth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as
port of as against the same, it is now here ordere
Court that the said petition be, and the same i
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1040. Ajax Rail Anchor Company,
vs. Petitioner,
The P and M Company.

On petition f
tiorari to th
Circuit Cou
for the Sev

On consideration of the petition for a writ of c
to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon ha
support of as against the same, it is now here order
that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Compagnie Générale Transatlantique,
Owner and Claimant of the Steamship
"California",
1041. vs. Petitioner,
A. J. and J. J. McCollum, Inc., et al.

On petit
Certiora
States C
Appea
Circui

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certi
United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second
the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in su
the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that th
and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George I. Uhler and John K.
Crone, Local Inspectors etc., etc.,
1062. vs. Petitioners,
New York & Porto Rico Steamship
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, for the respondent.

The United States of America,
1100. vs. Petitioner,
George W. Nein.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien, for the respondent.

John Dillon,
862. vs.
Strathearn Steamship Company.
Claimant, etc.
Erik Sandberg et al.,
935. vs. Petitioners,
John McDonald, Claimant etc.
Paul Neilson et al.,
936. vs. Petitioners,
Rhine Shipping Co., Claimant etc.
John Hardy et al.,
937. vs. Petitioners,
Shepard & Morse Lumber Co., Claimant etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in behalf of the United States, leave is hereby granted him to file briefs in these causes as amicus curiae.

Monday, June 3, 1918, continued

American Trading Company
(Pacific Coast),
1033. vs. Petitioner,
North Alaska Salmon
Company.

The petition for a
[illegible] herein to the
States Circuit Co
for the Ninth Circ
submitted to the c
of the Court on p
arguments by Mr. Frederick E. [illegible], in behalf of M
Knight, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter D. [illegible]
the respondent.

William A. Hartranft,
19. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Alexander R. Mullowny, Judge
of the Police Court of the District
of Columbia.

Mr. Matthew E. O
counsel for the pl
submitted to the c
of the Court a m
to present a peti
hearing within s

E. Kirby-Smith,
1049. vs. Petitioner
John B. Henry, Receiver, etc.

The petitions for a writ
herein to the United S
Court of Appeals for
Circuit were submitted
sideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E
and Mr. Henry J. Scott, for the petitioner, and by Mr. [illegible]
for the respondent.

The Thomas Manufacturing Company,
1008. vs. Petitioner,
The Moline Company.

The petition for a
[illegible] herein to
Appeals of the
[illegible]
the [illegible]

on printed arguments by Mr. Howard J. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. James L. Norris for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway
Company of Indiana,
1060. vs. Petitioner,
National Bank of Commerce of
Norfolk.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the petitioner.

Lee Mow Lin and Lee Bing,
1050. vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. J. Gerrity, in behalf of Mr. Webster A. Dunn, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the respondent.

Philadelphia & Reading
Coal & Iron Company,
1044. vs. Petitioner,
Carmine Saccipante.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. J. Gerrity, in behalf of Mr. Pierre M. Brown, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Seabury and Mr. William M. Seabury for the respondent.

Monday, June 3rd, 1918, continued.

G. T. Pepper, Trustee etc.,
1052. vs. Petitioner,
Georgia Iron & Coal Company
et al.

The petition for a writ
tiorari herein to the U
States Circuit Court o
Appeals for the Fift
Circuit was submit
the Consideration of the Court on printed arguments by
J. L. Burnett, in behalf of Mr. A. R. Moore and Mr. S. M.
bliss for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander C. King an
Clifford L. Anderson for the respondents.

State of Minnesota,
19 Orig. vs. Complainant,
State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. Frank
Kellogg, of counsel for
Complainant, It is no
ordered by the Court
is, and the same is hereby, granted to dispense with the rep
tion or printing of the original maps, drawings and diagra
turned by the Commissioner as exhibits to the testimony i
above-entitled cause, and that the Clerk of this Court b
he is hereby, authorized to return said original maps, d
and diagrams to the Commissioner who took the testimo
instructions to permit the counsel for the respective part
their convenience to duly inspect and examine said origi
drawings and diagrams to aid them in the preparation
maps for the final hearing, and when counsel have comp
inspection and examination said Commissioner is hereb
rected to return said original maps, drawings and diag
to the Clerk of this Court.

Monday, June 3d, 1918, Continued.

770. Hartford Beaumont, Assignee etc., et al., vs. Appellant & Plaintiffs in Error, Mauro Prieto et al., Administrators etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry W. Van Dyke, for the appellees and defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan and Mr. T. T. Ansberry, for the appellant and plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

901. W. H. Sterrett, as Receiver etc., vs. Petitioner, Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. George Huddleston, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

990. Midland Linseed Products Company, vs. Petitioner, The Steamship "Saturnus," her tackle etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander S. Stewart, in behalf of Mr. Norman S. Hertwig, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondents.

Monday, June 3d, 1918, continued.

Motion Picture Patents Company, Appeal fr
General Film Company, District C
Biograph Company, et al. United S
155. vs. Appellants. Eastern
The United States. Pennsylv

This cause having been called to the attention o
by Mr. Alexander S. Stewart in behalf of counsel f
and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appe
a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties,
in pursuance of said motion and stipulation, now
adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal
same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Wells Fargo & Company, The petition for a wr
1042. vs. Petitioner, herein to the United
Oscar G. Taylor. Circuit Court of A
Fifth Circuit was

the consideration of the Court on printed argume
H. S. Marx, in behalf of Mr. Brainerd P. [illegible],
and Mr. Charles W. Stockton, for the petitioner.

The Cuyahoga River Power Mr. George M.
Company, of counsel for th
1012. vs. Appellant, submitted to the
Northern Ohio Traction and of the Court a m
Light Company et al. course the Cour

3. 6.	Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. & The United States, Appellant, vs. Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company.	On motion of Mr. George A. King, for the Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for a rehearing herein within thirty days.
1026.	Margaret Corunn Radcliffe Pock, Petitioner, vs. Anne Wayne Sutor et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery and Mr. Edward P. Buford for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. S. C. Pattison for the respondent.

887.	Guerini Stone Company, Petitioner, vs. P. J. Carlin Construction Company.	Mr. Henry P. Blair, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
1031.	Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. John C. Webb, individually & for use of Lesser Insurance Company et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of

the Court by Mr. John E. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alex. C. King and Mr. A. H. Porter for the respondent.

Coal & Coke Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1088. vs.
Oscar V. Ewing.

The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. [illegible] and Mr. George E. Price, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edmund M. [illegible], for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
909. vs.
J. V. Terry. and

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
910. vs.
J. V. Terry.

The motions to dismiss these causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the defendant in error, in support of the motions, and by Mr. Henry T. Gage and Mr. William F. [illegible] for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

International Paper Company,
Petitioner,
1095. vs.
The Schooner Gracie D. Chambers,
her tackle etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. [illegible] for the petitioner.

†

1016. Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. John Downs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sydney A. Syme for the respondent.

1082. Alexander Gladstone, alias William Vine, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Benjamin L. McKinley for the petitioner.

1081. John W. Roberts, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Benjamin L. McKinley for the petitioner.

1083. Dan A. Ware and W. A. Greenwood, Petitioners, vs. Thomas W. Morgan, Warden &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, for the petitioner.

Southern Pacific Company,
1066. vs. Petitioner,
Industrial Accident Commission
of the State of California et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Charles H. Bates, in behalf of Mr. William F. Herrin and Mr. Henley C. Booth, for the petitioner.

The B. F. Goodrich Company,
1086. vs. Petitioner,
Consolidated Rubber Tire
Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. D. Kerr, in behalf of Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Samuel E. Hibben, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. Stapleton for the respondents.

Marcel Akulitis,
514. vs. Petitioner,
Philadelphia & Reading Coal
& Iron Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. H. Johnston in behalf of Mr. [illegible] [illegible], for the petitioner; and by Mr. Pierce A. [illegible] for the respondent.

1061.
[illegible] P. Chapman and [illegible] C. Chapman,
vs. Petitioners,
John H. Wentworth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. S. Bushman, Mr. John L. Jackson and Mr. Albert H. Adams for the petitioners.

1067.
Dud Moore,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. B. King, in behalf of Mr. James C. Denton and Mr. Frank Lee, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the respondent.

1101.
Logan Billingsley and Fred Billingsley,
vs. Petitioners
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. John A. Kratz, in behalf of Mr. Charles A. Spink for the petitioners.

1059.
Republic Rubber Company,
vs. Petitioner,
[illegible] Rubber Tire Company et al.

The petition for a writ of Certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Francis M. Phelps, Mr. William H. Dyrenforth and Mr. George A. Chritton for the petitioners and by Mr. Charles W. Stapleton for the respondents.

Charles A. Kiewert,
1087. vs. Petitioner,
Alfred G. Stallings et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner.

Ikram Glass Manufacturing Company,
1064. vs. Petitioner,
Homer Brooke Glass Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James Lee Hopkins and Mr. George A. Chritton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. William G. McKnight for the respondent.

Frederick Krafft,
1065. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Seth Shepard, in behalf of Mr. Walter Miller, for the petitioner.

In re Albert [illegible] Propper. Mr. Charles W. Needham, for the Committee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a report of the Committee of the Bar and a request for an order to show cause.

1038. Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John B. Corliss and Mr. Paul B. Moody for the petitioner, and by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson and Mr. William L. Carpenter for the respondent.

763. J. A. Gates, F. R. Egger, Mary E. Taylor, et al., Appellants,
vs.
W. C. Berryhill, as Tax Collector of Broward County.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lew You,
336. vs. Appellant,
Edward White, Commissioner
of Immigration for the Port of
San Francisco.

Appeal from the District
Court of the United States
for the Northern District
of California.

It appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thomas W. Palmer, as Administrator
of the Estate of E. M. Harmary, deceased,
462. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Wichita Falls & Northwestern Railway
Company and Missouri, Kansas & Texas
Railway Company.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of
Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George W. Farrell and Rebecca E. Farrell, his wife, and Fred Land Company,
479. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The City of Seattle.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of record in this cause, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The National City Bank of Chicago,
648. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mrs. Georgia S. Barringer.

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, State of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Smith and Elizabeth Smith,
Plaintiffs in Error,
780. vs.
Thomas Elevator Company and Emmet A. Thomas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Nora Herlihy, Administratrix of the Estate of John Herlihy, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
841. vs.
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record in this cause, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, June 10th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that D. H. Cantrell, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, and John G. Buchanan, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. D. Baldwin, it is ordered that Ashby C. Dickson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, and Edgar T. Brandenburg, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 10th 1918, Continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr
W. Scott, it is ordered that Thomas R. [illegible], Esquire
Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice
as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by
John E. Raker, it is ordered that Warren S. Edwards, Esq
of Fresno, and Lee Gebhart, Esquire, of Sacramento, State
California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counse
of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by
C. Edward Wright, it is ordered that Charles R. Wimm
and [illegible], Esquire, of [illegible], State of Virginia,
Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitt
practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and
were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr
P. Wilfley, it is ordered that Abraham L. [illegible], Esquire
St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr
L. Hunt, it is ordered that William P. [illegible], Esquire,
[illegible], State of New York, be admitted to practice as
torney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac

Monday, June 10th, 1918, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jeremiah C. Smith, it is ordered that T. Meriwether Smith, Esquire, of Harrodsburg, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, it is ordered that Evan L. Nylund and Thomas M. Askren, Esquires, of Seattle, State of Washington, J. Elmer Peak, Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, and Arthur P. Hicks, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, it is ordered that John Kennedy White, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Kirby, it is ordered that Grover C. Gates, Esquire, of Newport, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Adalbert L. Hubbell, Esquire, of Kelso, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. McKinney, it is ordered that Forrest S. Fisher, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon,

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that William L. [illegible], and Sydney E. [illegible], Esquire, a [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible], Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Becker, it is ordered that Philip [illegible], Esquire, of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Sabath, it is ordered that [illegible], Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] [illegible], it is ordered that Thomas T. [illegible], Esquire, of Morristown, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] M. Weaver, it is ordered that John L. [illegible], Esquire, of [illegible], State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 10th 1918, Continued.

B. A. Nickins,
265. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. S. Kingsbury, as Register
of the State Land Office.

In Error to the Supreme Court
of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
Railway Company, Chicago, St. Paul,
Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company,
and Minneapolis Eastern Railway
Company,
235. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Northern Pacific Railway Company, | In Er
205. vs. Plaintiff in Error, | Court
M. J. Solum. | Minn

This cause came on to be heard on the tra
record from the Supreme Court of the State of Min
argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is
and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of th
Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, rever
that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded
preme Court for further proceedings not inconsisten
of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Northern Pacific Railway | In Error to th
Company, | Court of the S
206. vs. Plaintiff in Error, | Minnesota.
Monarch Elevator Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran
from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, a
counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now he
judged by this Court that the judgment of the Supre
this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed an
cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the
for further proceedings not inconsistent with the op

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Northern Pacific Railway Company,
No. 26. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Duluth Elevator Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The State of Arkansas,
4 Orig. vs. Complainant,
The State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard at this Term and was argued by counsel; and thereupon and on consideration thereof, it was

Ordered, Adjudged and Decreed as follows, viz:

1. The true boundary line between the States of Arkansas and Tennessee, aside from the question of the avulsion of 1876, hereinafter mentioned, is the middle of the main channel of navigation of the Mississippi River, as it existed at the Treaty of Peace concluded between the United States and Great Britain in 1783, subject to such changes as have occurred since that time through natural and gradual processes.

2. By the avulsion of March 7, 1876, which resulted in the formation of a new channel known as the Centennial Cut-off, the boundary line between said States was unaffected, and remained in the middle of the former main channel of navigation as above defined.

3. The boundary line between the said States should now be located along that portion of the bed of said river that was left dry as the result of said avulsion, according to the middle of the main navigable

channel as it existed at the time the current ceased to flow therein as the result of said avulsion.

4. A commission consisting of C. B. Bailey, of Wynne, Arkansas, Horace Vandeventer, of Knoxville, Tennessee, and Charles A. Barton, of Memphis, Tennessee, competent persons, is here and now named by the Court, upon the suggestion of counsel, to run, locate and designate the boundary line between said States along that portion of the bed of said river that was left dry as the result of said avulsion, in accordance with the above principles: Commencing at the upper end of the abandoned portion of the river bed at or about the beginning or head of said Centennial Cut-off, and thence following along the middle of the former main channel of navigation by its several courses and windings to the lower end of the abandoned portion of said river bed at or about the terminus or outlet of said Centennial Cut-off.

5. In the event the said Commission cannot now locate with reasonable certainty the line of the river as it then ran, that is, at or immediately before the avulsion of 1876, it shall report the nature and extent of the erosions and accretions that occurred in the old channel prior to its abandonment by the current as the result of said avulsion, and in said report, if necessary to be made in accordance with this paragraph of the decree said Commission shall give its findings of fact and the evidence on which the same are based.

6. Before entering upon the discharge of their duties, each of said commissioners shall be duly sworn to perform faithfully, impartially and without prejudice or bias the duties hereby imposed, said oaths to be taken before the Clerk of this Court, or before the Clerk of any District Court of the United States, or before any officer authorized by law to administer an oath in the State of Arkansas or of Tennessee, and to be returned with their report; that said Commission is authorized and

empowered to make examination of the territory in question, and to adopt all ordinary and legitimate methods in the ascertainment of the true location of said boundary line; to summon witnesses and take evidence under oath, to compel the attendance of witnesses and require them to testify; to call for and require the production of papers and other documentary evidence, such evidence, however, to be taken upon notice to the parties, with permission to attend by counsel and cross-examine the witnesses; and all evidence taken and all exceptions thereto and rulings thereon shall be preserved and certified and returned with the report of said commissioners; and said commissioners are also at liberty to refer to and consult the printed record in the cause and the opinion of this Court delivered on March 4, 1918, and to do all other matters necessary to enable them to discharge their duties and attain the end to be accomplished conformably to this decree.

7. It is further ordered that should any vacancy or vacancies occur in said board of commissioners by reason of death, refusal to act, or inability to perform the duties required by this decree, the Chief Justice of this Court is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint another commissioner or commissioners to supply such vacancy or vacancies, the Chief Justice acting upon such information in the premises as may be satisfactory to him.

8. It is further ordered that said commissioners do proceed with all convenient dispatch to discharge their duties conformably to this decree, and they are authorized, if they deem it necessary, to request the Coöperation and assistance of the State authorities of Arkansas and Tennessee, or either of those States, in the performance of the duties hereby imposed.

9. It is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court shall forward at once to the Governor of each of said States of Arkansas and Tennessee and to each of the commissioners hereby appointed a copy of this decree and of the opinion of this Court delivered herein March 4, 1918, duly authenticated.

10. The said Commissioners shall make a report of their proceedings

under this decree [illegible] the [illegible] of the Court, and shall [illegible] report an itemized statement of [illegible] expenses incurred by them in the Performance of their duties.

11. All other matters are reserved until the coming in of said report.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Plaintiff in Error,
273. vs.
The City of Newport, Kentucky.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Jim Butler Tonopah Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error,
249. vs.
West End Consolidated Mining Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the

record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Grinnell Washing Machine Company, Petitioner,
270. vs.
E. E. Johnson Company.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Exploration Company, Limited, and Philip L. Foster, Appellants,
277. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth

Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.
(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the decision).

371\.
The Toledo Newspaper Company and Negley D. Cochran, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the decision of this case).

371. The Toledo Newspaper Company
and Negley D. Cochran,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the transcript of record on the writ of error to stand as a return to said writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

371. The Toledo Newspaper Company
and Negley D. Cochran,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the decision of this case).

Monday, June 10th, 1918, Continued.

554. [illegible] Stone Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
P. J. Carlin Construction Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

901. W. C. Sterrett, as Receiver of the Alabama Trust & Savings Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1012. The Cuyahoga River Power Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Northern Ohio Traction and Light Company and The Northern Ohio Power Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

L. Louise Miller et al.,
[illegible] vs. Appellants,
John Wittkamp et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hartford Beaumont, Assignee
of W. Burck,
770. vs. Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
Mauro Prieto, Benito Legarda, Jr. and
Benito Valdes, as Administrators of the
Estate of Benito Legarda, deceased, and
Benito Valdes.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Pacific Company,
909. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. V. Terry.
and
Southern Pacific Company,
910. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. V. Terry.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motions to dismiss in these causes be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the causes on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 10th, 1918, Continued.

557. Guerini Stone Company,
vs. Petitioner,
P. J. Carlin Construction Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

901. W. C. Skerrett, as Receiver of the Alabama Trust & Savings Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1012. The Cuyahoga River Power Company,
vs. Appellant,
The Northern Ohio Traction and Light Company and The Northern Ohio Power Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Miller et al.,
[illegible]. vs. Appellants.
John [illegible] et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hartford Beaumont, Assignee
of W. Borck,
770. vs. Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
Mauro Prieto, Benito Legarda, Jr. and
Benito Valdes, as Administrators of the
Estate of Benito Legarda, deceased, and
Benito Valdes.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Pacific Company,
909. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. V. Terry.
and
Southern Pacific Company,
910. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. V. Terry.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motions to dismiss in these causes be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the causes on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 10th, 1918, continued.

1042. Wells Fargo & Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Oscar G. Taylor.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1061. Matthew T. Chapman and Mark C. Chapman, Petitioners,
vs.
John A. Wintroath.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1066. Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Mary E. Butler and Albert [illegible] Butler, a minor, by Mary E. Butler, his guardian ad litem.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1057.	Charles A. Hitchcock, Petitioner, vs. Alfred G. Scattergood, James H. [illegible], Francis H. Quinn, et al., and American Pipe and Construction Company.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1098.	International Paper Company, Petitioner, vs. The Schooner Gracie D. Chambers, her tackle, etc., Florence G. Payne, Claimant.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Butte & Superior Copper Company, Petitioner,
1003. vs.
Clark - Montana Realty Company and Elm Orlu Mining Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marcel Akaliko, Petitioner,
514. vs.
Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Thomas Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
1008. vs.
The Aeolian Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari

herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1026.

Margaret Corwin Radcliffe Gooch,
Petitioner,
vs.
Annie Wayne Sutor and George Sutor, her husband, Old Dominion Trust Company, as Trustee etc., et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1033.

American Trading Company, (Pacific Coast),
Petitioner,
vs.
North Alaska Salmon Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Western Union Telegraph
Company,
1038. vs. Petitioner,
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton
Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari
to the Supreme Court of the
State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. Kirby-Smith,
1049. vs. Petitioner,
John O. Sheatz, Receiver of the
International Lumber &
Development Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lee Mow Lin & Lee Ping,
1050. vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to
the United States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1051. Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. John C. Webb, individually, and for use of Queen Insurance Company and London & Lancashire Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1052. J. T. Peoples, Trustee in Bankruptcy, for Georgia Steel Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Georgia Iron & Coal Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 10th, 1918, continued.

1059. Republic Rubber Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Consolidated Rubber Tire Company and Rubber Tire Wheel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1086. The B. F. Goodrich Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Consolidated Rubber Tire Company and Rubber Tire Wheel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1060. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company of Indiana, Petitioner,
vs.
National Bank of Commerce of Norfolk

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1062.	George T. Charlton & John L. Evans, Local Inspectors of Steam Vessels for the Port of New York, et al., Petitioners, vs. New York & Porto Rico Steamship Company.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1063.	Salem Glass Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. Stone Brooks Glass Company.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick Kraft,
1065. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for w
to the United S
Court of Appea
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of cert
the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
and of the argument of counsel in support of the same
now ordered by this Court that the said petition be,
is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dud Moore,
1067. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for w
to the United S
Court of Appe
Eighth Circu

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiora
United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth
of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as
the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the
and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alexander Gladstone, alias
William Vines,
1082. vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America.

On petition for w
to the United S
Court of Appea
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of ce to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel ~~thereupon had, as well~~ in support of ~~and against~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1083.	Alan A. Ward and W. A. Greenwood, Petitioners, vs. Thomas W. Morgan, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1088.	Coal & Coke Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Oscar F. Ewing.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1090. Midland Linseed Products Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The Steamship "Telamon", her tackle etc., Koninklijke Nederlandsche Stoomboot Maatschappij, Claimant.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1091. John W. Roberts, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1094. Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company, Petitioner,
vs.
[illegible] Saracino.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1164.	Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. John Powers.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1160.	The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. George W. Hein.	On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition &c, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1101.

Logan Billingsley and Sam Billingsley,
vs. Petitioners,
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

In re Albert Herschel de Propper.

On consideration of the report of the Committee of the Bar appointed in the matter of the propriety of striking from the roll of the members of the Bar of this Court the name of Albert Herschel de Propper,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Albert Herschel de Propper show cause before this Court at the City of Washington on Tuesday, October 8th, 1918, at twelve o'clock noon of that day, why, in view of the Report of said Committee, his name should not be stricken from the roll of the members of the Bar of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7.	The United States of America, vs. Appellant, Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.
27.	The Buckeye Powder Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Company et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.
68.	The United States of America, vs. Appellant, Reading Company et al.	
	& Reading Company et al., vs. Appellant,	It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument.
80.	The United States of America.	Per Mr. Chief Justice White.
207.	The United States, vs. Appellant, United Shoe Machinery Company of New Jersey et al.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, leave is hereby granted him to present a petition for rehearing herein within thirty days.
704.	W. C. Hammer, United States Attorney, etc., vs. Appellant, Roland H. Dagenhart et al	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, leave is hereby granted him to present a petition for rehearing herein within thirty days.

Fernetta J. McCoy et al., Executors, etc., 190. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Union Elevated Railroad Company et al.	On motion of Mr. William C. Sullivan, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing herein within sixty days.

In re Garland Biffle. Mr. Scott Ferris submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to strike the name of Garland Biffle from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in this Court.

In re Garland Biffle. On consideration of the motion of Scott Ferris, Esquire, to vacate the order of October 1st, 1917, admitting Garland Biffle to practice in this Court, and to strike his name from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in this Court,

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the said Garland Biffle on Tuesday, October 8th next, why said motion should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White:

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, 1029. vs. Petitioner, Alice Frances Bowers et al.	Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for an order

staying further proceedings in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit pending action of this Court on the petition for a writ of certiorari. Whereupon,

upon consideration thereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice to a submission of said motion to said Circuit Court of Appeals or a renewal of said motion to this Court.

Philadelphia, Baltimore and
Washington Railroad Company,
1081. vs. Petitioner,
Alfred N. Smith.

Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for an order staying further proceedings in the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland pending action of this Court on the petition for a writ of certiorari. Whereupon, upon consideration thereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice to a submission of said motion to said Court of Appeals or a renewal of said motion to this Court.

The Toledo Newspaper
Company et al.,
371. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Joseph S. Graydon, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing herein within thirty days.

Monday June 10th, 1918, continued.

Order.

It is now here ordered by the Court that all the cases on the docket not decided and all the other business of the term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.

VOLU

19

ME

18

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the seventh day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law:

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. T. A. E. Weadock, it is ordered that John Coote

of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admi
practice as attorneys and counsellors of
Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
behalf by Mr. F. Carroll Todd, it is or
that J. Merritt Wright, Esquire, of Pitt
State of Pennsylvania, David L. Sta
Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Penn
:vania; Albert F. Liddell, Esquire, of Pi
burgh, State of Pennsylvania, Henry F
Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, R
A. Hunter, Esquire, of Shreveport, State
Louisiana; and Frederick A. Mohr, Es
of Auburn, State of New York, be admi
to practice as attorneys and counsellors
this Court, and they were sworn accordi

On motion first made to the Court
this behalf by Mr. Attorney General
it is ordered that Claude R. Porter, Es
of Centerville, State of Iowa, be admi
to practice as an attorney and counsel
this Court and he was sworn accordin

On motion first made to the Court i
this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson
is ordered that James H. Anderson, Es
of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be
mitted to practice as an attorney and c
sellor of this Court

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman it is ordered that J. W. Pless, Esquire, of Marion, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Stanley Moore, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Frear, it is ordered that John Ewart Tracy, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Walter Carroll Low, Esquire, of New York City, Norbert Heinsheimer, Esquire, of New York City, and John R. Lazenby, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were

On motion first made to the Cour
behalf by Mr. H. Ralph Burton it is
that Frederick W. Gaines, Esquire, o
State of Ohio be admitted to practice
attorney and counsellor of this Court a
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Cour
this behalf by Mr. Charles Y. Wittman
ordered that Roger Hinds, Esquire, of
York City, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this Court,
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Cour
this behalf by Mr. William L. Coley, i
ordered that Henry Wiley Johnson, E
of Savannah, State of Georgia, be adm
to practice as an attorney and counselle
this Court, and he was sworn according

On motion first made to the Cour
this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield
ordered that Frederick R. Shearer of W
ington, District of Columbia, be admit
to practice as an attorney and counse
of this Court, and he was sworn accor

On motion first made to the Cou
this behalf by Mr. William Mc Leod

of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, it is ordered that Thomas M. Kirby, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucas P. Loving, it is ordered that Arthur Mayer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger, it is ordered that Samuel Marcus, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. S. Gottlieb, it is ordered that Henry Rosenberg, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry N. Ellis, it is ordered that Isidor Kalisch, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Still, it is ordered that Francis Lafferty, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Paul Lamb it is ordered that C. H. Henkel, Esquire, of Mansfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Gillinger it is ordered that Henry A. Brann, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey R. Stevens

Esquire of Hagerstown, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Spotswood D. Bowers, Esquire, of New York City, and Morris L. Johnston, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Garland Dupré it is ordered that Benjamin W. Hart, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, and H. H. Young, Esquire of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Winston Read, it is ordered that Marques Jones, Esquire, of Newport News, State of Virginia, and Joseph A. Massie, Esquire, of Newport News, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and

On motion first made to the Co
this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston
ordered that Basil Manly Magruder of
wood, State of Mississippi, be admitted
practice as an attorney and counsellor of
Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff
ordered that C. W. Prince, Esquire, of
City, State of Missouri, be admitted to
tice as an attorney and counsellor of
Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in
behalf, by Mr. Andrew P. Newburg, it
ordered that Robert H. Blair, of Wythe
State of Virginia be admitted to pr
as an attorney and counsellor of this C
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
this behalf by Mr. R. Wayne Parker,
ordered that James A. Hamill, Esquire,
Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admi
to practice as an attorney and counsel
this Court, and he was sworn according

The Chief Justice announced that
motions noticed for to-day would be hea
tomorrow, and the Court adjourned

moves the call of the docket pursuant to the twenty sixth rule.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, October 15th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that T. Alan Goldsborough, Esquire, of Denton, State of Maryland, John R. Ryan, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York and Eugene L. Kominick, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Eugene A. Bennet, it is of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson, it is ordered that Frank S. Carden, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, it is ordered that Horace Paul Herman, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson, it is ordered that Earl W. Killion, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Hastings, it is ordered that H. H. Humphrey, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of

4 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harvey C. Shawver.

On motion of Mr. F. Carroll Todd, Assistant to the Attorney General, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

6 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company;

---

11 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Reading Company, et al.;

---

13 Reading Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America;

---

22 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. United States Steel Corporation et al.;

On motion of Mr. F. Carroll Todd, Assistant to the Attorney General, for the United States, it is ordered by the Court that these causes be and the same are hereby continued until the next term,

Monday, October 14th 1918, continued.

23 Eastman Kodak Company
et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America;

---

88 Associated Bill Posters and
Distributors of the United
States and Canada et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States;

---

66 The United States, Appellant,
vs.
American Can Company et al.;

---

86 The United States, Appellant,
vs.
The Quaker Oats Company et al.;

---

224 The United States of America,
Appellant,
vs.
Southern Pacific Company
et al.;

---

71 Corn Products Refining Company,
et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America.

202 Southern Oregon Company, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Special motion for leave to file petition in the District Court for the sale of timber submitted by Mr. J. Carroll Todd, Assistant to the Attorney General, for the United States.

236 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Federal Publishing Company,
and
237 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Butterick Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

These causes having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writs of error in these causes; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writs of error in these causes be, and the same are hereby, dismissed.

347 John E. Reese, Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America
et al.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the Appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

367 The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
C. T. Doremus
and
370 W. S. Webb et al.,
vs.
The United States of America

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the United States it is ordered that these causes be reassigned for Monday, December 9th, next.

408 The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Henry Gulyer.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

135 Red Jacket Jr. Coal Company et al., Appellants,
vs.
United Thacker Coal Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Arthur S. Dayton in support of the same, and Mr. E. Spencer Miller in opposition thereto.

664 The Hebe Company et al., Appellants,
vs.
Norman E. Shaw, Secretary of Agriculture of Ohio et al.

Mr. Charles E. Hughes, of counsel for the appellants submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

457 The Zanesville & Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles E. Williams, Administrator &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause and to transfer the cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. F. S. Monnett in support of the same and Mr. John H. Doyle and Mr. Frederick W. Kinney [illegible]

Tuesday, October 8th 1918, continued.

to counsel for the defendant in error to file an additional brief within six days.

457 The Evansville & Western Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles E. Williams, Administrator &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Doyle in support of the same.

26 Adams State Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

On motion of Mr. Frank H. Bicek for the plaintiff in error it is ordered that this cause be passed per stipulation of counsel.

536 Duplex Printing Press Company, Appellant,
vs.
Emil J. Deering et al. &c.

Mr. Daniel Davenport for the Appellant submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

98 Rebecca Crum,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

Mr. James H. Carpenter, Jr., for the Plaintiff to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause pursuant to the provisions of rule 32.

36
The Hardin-Wyandot Lighting Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Village of Upper Sandusky

On motion of Mr. William R. Marx in behalf of counsel it is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby continued until the next term.

305
Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Henry L. Bogert et al. Executors &c., et al.

The petition of Albert L. Polak for leave to intervene herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Norbert Heinsheimer for Polak.

47
James G. Petrie et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby [illegible] subject to the [illegible] section 9, rule 26.

—Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Whitney Steamboat Corporation, Petitioner. Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. Alexander S. Bacon, for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause.

—Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of Charles W. Crown, Petitioner. Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in this cause.

693 Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company, Appellant, vs. Walter H. Evans et al. Mr. Frederick S. Tyler of counsel for the appellees having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States of America, }
District of Oregon } SS.

I, G. H. Marsh, Clerk of the Dist-

District of Oregon do hereby certify that on January 3, 1916, the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon entered an order and judgment in a certain cause then pending in the said Court numbered 6910, in which the Brunswick-Balke-Collander Company, a corporation, was complainant and Walter H. Evans et al., were defendants, denying the application of the said plaintiff Brunswick-Balke-Collander Company, a corporation for a preliminary injunction. That on January 20, 1916, said complainant Brunswick-Balke-Collander Company filed its petition for the allowance of an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, and upon said January 20, 1916, the appeal of the said plaintiff was allowed by the honorable Charles E. Wolverton, one of the judges of said District Court.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court at Portland in said District this 18th day of February 1918.

(Seal)

(Signed) G. H. Marsh,
Clerk.

and moved the Court to

miss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule; And it appearing to the Court that the Appellant has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court: It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

336 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Fletcher Paper Company.

---

337 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Island Mill Lumber Company.

---

338 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Churchill Lumber Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, or to transfer the causes to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed argu-

339 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Richardson Lumber Company

and

340 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Michigan Veneer Company.

Butler in behalf of Mr. Edward S. Clark in support of the same and by Mr. James McNamara and Mr. Fred A. Baker in opposition thereto.

239 The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Giusta Da Villa, Royal Italian Consul, as Administrator &c.

The motion for leave to amend statement of points relied upon and to print additional parts of the record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Prentiss and Mr. E. N. Clark in support of the same, and by Mr. J. W. Sanborn in opposition thereto.

305 Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner
vs.
Henry L. Bogart et al. Executors &c., et al.

The petition of Henry J. Chase for leave to intervene was submitted tion of the Court by Mr. A. M. Schaffer in behalf of counsel.

3058 Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. Henry L. Bogert et al., Executors, &c., et al. The petitions of Fergus Reid, Francis P. O'Reilly and The Corn Exchange Bank for leave to intervene herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of counsel.

344 Hamil McPhillips et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. C. Mitchell & Helen E. Mitchell. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of Mr. C. B. Stuart in support of the same and by Mr. Milton Brown in opposition thereto.

442 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Alice Vance Brown. The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. John Hampton Barnes for the petitioner and by Mr. G. R. White and Mr. William A. Glasgow Jr. for the respondent.

454 Hubbard-Zemurray Steamship Company, Petitioner vs. Aktieselskabet Stavangeren. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter S. Penfield in behalf of Mr. Thomas J. Freeman for the petitioner.

459 Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner vs. Edwin Hale Abbot;

—

460 Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner vs. Edwin Hale Abbot;

—

461 Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner vs. Preston B. Keith;

—

462 Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Preston B. Keith;

—

463 Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
John S. Ames;

—

464 Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
John S. Ames;

—

465 Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Maria A. Evans, Executrix;

—

466 Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
George E. Keith;

—

467 Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
George E. Keith;

—

Columbia-Knickerbocker

The petition for
writs of certiorari
herein was sub-
mitted to the con-
sideration of the
Court on printed
arguments by
Mr. Albert R.

468
vs.
Mary O. Cordingley.

Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner,
469
vs.
Mary O. Cordingley.

Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner,
470
vs.
H. Lothrop Ames.

and

Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner,
471
vs.
H. Lothrop Ames.

Robert McMonies and Mr. John O'Hanick for the petitioner and by Mr. Moorfield Storey, Mr. Robert G. Dodge and Mr. Edwin N. Abbot, Jr., for the respondents.

Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Company, Petitioner,
472
vs.
Alfred N. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the petitioner and by Mr. T. Alan Goldsborough for the respondent.

477 Stanley Pollock, Petitioner, The petition for
vs.

The Monongahela & St Louis Railroad Company. tiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George Hoffman on behalf of Mr. Humphrey Barton for the petitioner and by Mr. J. M. Miner for the respondent.

178 Black Mountain Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Lena Murpower, Administratrix, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. N. Pless and Mr. Murray Allen, for the petitioner and by Mr. A. Hall Johnston for the respondent.

183 Union Tool Company, Petitioner, vs. Elihu C. Wilson

and

184 Union Tool Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Wilson & Willard Manufacturing Company.— The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. S. S. Gregory, and Frederick S. Lyon for the petitioners and by Mr. N. P. Holkampter for the respon-

483 William Kinzell, Petitioner,
vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran and Mr. John C. Gray for the petitioner and by Mr. Herman H. Field for the respondent.

488 The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
William P. Gallagher as guardian of Anna L. Garrity, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic W. McKenney in behalf of Mr. Robert E. Whalen and Mr. Frank V. Whiting for the petitioner and by Mr. Preston E. Lewis and Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the respondent.

489. Gulfport Towing Company, Claimant &c., Petitioner,
vs.
The Ollinger and Bruce Dry Dock Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Palmer Pillans for the petitioner and by Mr. Harry T. Smith for the respondent.

490

Edward A. S. Warner,
Petitioner
vs.
Lester Piano Company
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Arthur McGirk and Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondents.

495

J. Corry King, Petitioner,
vs.
Fred B. Rhodes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Mayer Lowe and Mr. Walter C. Balderson for the petitioner.

501

The Pennsylvania Railroad
Company, Petitioner
vs.
Mary Ellen Long, Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the petitioner and by Mr. A. Leftwich Sinclair for the respondent.

503 Herbert E. Edwards,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William R. Harr, in behalf of Mr. Rufus S. Day and Mr. Luther Day for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the respondent.

507 E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

---

508 E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Company.

---

509 E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Chicago & Alton Railroad Company.

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. [illegible]

Tuesday, October 8th 1878, continued.

510 vs.
The Missouri Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. Buckner F. Weatherage for the Plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
511 vs.
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company,

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
512 vs.
St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Company.

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
513 vs.
Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
514 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company and

E. B. Spiller
515 vs. Plaintiff in Error,

518

Lurena P. Connelly,
Administrator et al.
Petitioners
vs.
Celia Diamond et al.

The petition fo
writ of certio
herein was su
to the conside
of the Court o
printed argu
by Mr. Webster Ballinger on behalf of
Charles W. Beale for the petitioner.

520

The Grand Rapids &
Indiana Railway Com
pany, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of
America.

The petition fo
of certiorari h
was submitted
the considerati
the Court on p
arguments by
Frederic W. M
ney and Mr. James A. Campbell for t
petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General
and Mr. Assistant Attorney Davison f
respondent.)

523

Western Union Telegraph
Company, Appellant,
vs.
The Atlanta & West Point
Railroad Company.

—

524.

Western Union Telegraph
Company, Appellant,
vs.
Louisville & Nashville

The petitions
writs of certio
herein were s
mitted to the
consideration

Tuesday, October 8th 1918, continued.

Railroad Company
vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company, Appellant
525 vs.
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway Co.

on printed arguments by Mr. William L. Granbery and Mr. Rush Taggart for the appellant in support of the petitions and by Mr. Claude Waller and Mr. Saunders McDaniel for the appellee in No. 523, and by Mr. Henry L. Stone and Mr. Henry C. Peeples for the appellee in No. 524.

B. C. Lee, Petitioner
328 vs.
Central of Georgia Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George A. King in behalf of Mr. William H. Osborne and Mr. Alexander A. Lawrence for the petitioner and by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr. for the respondent.

Elizabeth Hull, Administratrix, Petitioner
329 vs.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

Mr. Harvey R. Spencer for the petitioner.

530 North Michigan Water Company, Petitioner, vs. City of Escanaba et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harry G. Gault in behalf of Mr. Arthur H. Ryall and Mr. John E. Tracy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the respondent.

533 Gee Woe, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

542 Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. George M. Brown, Executor &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Paul E. Lesh on behalf of Mr. Rush C.

Beverly L. Hodghead for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Hunsaker and Mr. E. W. Britt for the respondent.

552 River Sand & Gravel Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans, [illegible], &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. John W. Price for the petitioner.

555 Jesse G. Warren, Petitioner,
vs.
The Postal Telegraph Cable Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank W. Hackett and Mr. Paul J. Sherwood for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry A. Knapp for the respondent.

557 Charles H. Mayer, Petitioner
vs.
A. and H. G. Mutschler et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

John T. Ryan and Mr. Charles Black for the petitioner.

558 Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Adolphus Edwards Richards, Mr. Alexander P. Humphrey and Mr. Rush Taggart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry L. Stone and Helm Bruce for the respondent.

562 Newton Medkiff, Petitioner, vs. Sabin W. Colton, Jr., et al., Trustees &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Maynard F. Stiles for the petitioner.

567 Rederiaktiebolaget Atlanten, Petitioner, vs. Aktieselskabet Korn-Og Foderstof Kompagniet.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Barnett Alden on behalf of Mr. [illegible] for the petitioners and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.

568 George A. Cole et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Joseph Ralph.

and

569 George A. Cole et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Joseph Ralph.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Prentiss and Mr. George B. Walcher for the petitioners.

570 Harley Davidson Motor Company et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Roderick S. Smith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William S. Hodges and Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks for the petitioners and by Mr. Charles J. Sturtevant and Mr. Archibald Cox for the respondents.

571 Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Mrs. Bessie Horton, Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

arguments by Mr. Theodore A. Peterson for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert W. Winston for the respondent.

573 Louis Makin et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins on behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners.

574 David N. E. Jones, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America upon the relation of Dreispich & Son Company,

and

575 David N. E. Jones, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America upon the relation of Dreispich & Son Company. The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Henry Butler on behalf of Mr. Frederick M. Brown for the petitioners and by Mr. A. Leo Everett for the re-

Martha W. Whitaker, indi-
vidually and as executrix
&c., Petitioner,
379 vs.
The Whitaker Iron Com-
pany, et al.

The petition for a
writ of certiorari
herein was sub-
mitted to the con-
sideration of the
Court on printed
arguments by Mr.
Henry A. Brown, Jr., and Mr. Eugene Sweeney
for the petitioner.

Eleanor F. Browning,
Petitioner,
382 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company,

The petition for a
writ of certiorari
herein was sub-
mitted to the con-
sideration of the
Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles
Breckinridge Pittmann and Mr. Roger Hinds
for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert H. Mc-
Carter for the respondent.

The State of Ohio on the
relation of the Hartford
Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
383 vs.
Robert H. Langdale, et al.

The petition for
a writ of certi-
orari herein was
submitted to the
consideration of
the Court on
printed arguments
by Mr. Edward A. Kauthoff in behalf of Mr.
Henry E. Cowles, Mr. James B. Jones, Mr.
George W. Nau and Mr. Reuben B. Jones

Bennett for the respondent.

586 Nellie Hodge, as Administratrix etc. et al., Petitioners
vs.
Arthur K. Meyer et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court and presented arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Taylor in behalf of Mr. Walter Carroll Low and Mr. Jules Chopak for the petitioners and by Mr. Howard Taylor, Mr. Philip W. Russell and Mr. Roy C. Gasser for the respondent.

587 Ernest G. Watkins, Petitioner
vs.
Genevieve K. Fisk

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. S. Herbert Fierst for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry F. Woodward for the respondent.

588 Reichert Towing Line, Inc., Petitioner
vs.
Home Insurance Company
and
589 Reichert Towing Line, Inc. Petitioner

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argu-

Jacob Rice. C. C. Calhoun in behalf of Mr. Francis Walton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lewis M. Brown, Mr. Samuel Park and Mr. Harry S. Mattison for the respondents.

590 William Snyder, Petitioner vs. Annie Snyder to the use of William L. Hunt. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James B. Reilly for the petitioner and by Mr. R. W. Bishop for the Respondent.

591 The United States of America, Petitioner vs. Susie Reynolds. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the Court on printed argument by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd on behalf of Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse W. Lipsick for the respondent.

595 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al., Petitioners vs. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was

to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Shirley Carter for the petitioners.

594 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Edwin Wyason Minter, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Shirley Carter for the petitioners and by Mr. James K. Symmers for the respondents.

596 Claude A. P. Turner, Petitioner, vs. Lewer & Webber Building Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Arthur McGuirk on behalf of Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioner and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondents.

Minnesota Separator, Ltd. et al., Petitioners

The petition for a writ of cer-

Butte & Superior Mining Company. — was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Henry D. Williams, Mr. William Houston Kenyon, Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Joseph W. McEnnery and Mr. Odell W. McConnell for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. J. Edgar Bull, Mr. J. Bruce Kremer and Mr. Kurnal R. Babbitt for the respondent.

600 Frank W. Darling, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Newport News. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Weston Read and Mr. Marcus Jones for the plaintiff in error in support of the same.

601 Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Panama Railroad Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr.

behalf of Mr. J. [illegible] Keeler for the petitioner and (by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the respondent.)

602 A. C. Robinson, Trustee &c.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Seaboard National Bank
of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Merritt Wright, Mr. Alvin A. Morris, Mr. Samuel McClay and Mr. Thomas Patterson for the petitioner and by Mr. Herman Aaron and Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., for the respondent.)

603 A. C. Robinson, Trustee
&c., Petitioner
vs.
J. H. Purdy.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Merritt Wright, Mr. Alvin A. Morris, Mr. Samuel McClay and Mr. Thomas Patterson for the petitioner and by Mr. Herman Aaron and Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., for the respondent.)

A. C. Robinson, Trustee
&c., Petitioner

The petition for a

604 Edward M. Hitchcock and Henry Wheeler, Trustee, &c. — herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Merrill Wright, Mr. Allen A. Moore, Mr. Samuel McClay, and Mr. Thomas Patterson for the petitioner and by Mr. Herman Oscar and Mr. M. H. Ochsner Jr. for the respondent.

605 Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, Petitioner, vs. Mt. Clemens Sugar Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. L. T. Michener in behalf of Mr. Harrison Geer for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas A. E. Weadock and Mr. John C. Weadock for the respondent.

610 Paul Hesse and Johannes Klattenhoff, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments, by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioners

612. R. McCulloch Dick, Petitioner, vs. Anton Hohmann, Acting Chief of Police of Manila.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. Evans Browne, and Mr. W. A. Kincaid for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the respondent.

613. The Montezuma Valley Irrigation District et al., Petitioners, vs. Mark Norris et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in behalf of Mr. B. W. Ritter for the petitioners and by Mr. Mark Norris, Mr. Clyde C. Dawson, Mr. Fred R. Wright and Mr. Charles S. Haight for the respondents.

614. Meccano Limited, Petitioner, vs. John Wanamaker, New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of printed arguments by Mr. Rome Lewis, Mr. W. B. Kirkham and Ralph L. Scott for the petitioner and by Mr. H. A. Robinson for the respondent.

618

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Petitioner,
vs.
Ynchausti & Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward S. Bailey and Mr. Chester J. Gerkin for the petitioners and Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne for the respondents.

619

Michael W. Bochner, Petitioner,
vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondent.

621

John A. S. Crumm et al., Petitioners,
vs.

622
Testamentary Trustee &c., et al., and
John A. S. Brown et al., Petitioners
vs.
Austin B. Fletcher as Testamentary Trustee &c., et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Messrs. Buckley and Mr. [illegible] H. Burr for the petitioners and by Mr. Selden Bacon and Mr. Austin B. Fletcher for the respondents.

623
The Toledo & Ohio Central Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
S. J. Kibler & Brothers Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. G. M. Gaines and Mr. John H. Doyle for the petitioner and by Mr. W. E. McBride for the respondent.

624
The Cudahy Packing Company, Petitioner
vs.
William K. Bixby et al. Receivers &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court [illegible]

Mr. Charles Bainbridge Whitman in behalf of Mr. George A. Buckingham for the petitioner and by Mr. James L. Minnis for the respondents.

626 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner
vs.
John E. Withey et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John J. Hamilton, in behalf of Mr. S. A. Wetlee for the petition.

627 Rosa C. DeRoest, Petitioner
vs.
Robert A. Young.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank D. Hackett for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick de Courcy Faust, Mr. Charles H. Wilson and Mr. George Kearney for the respondent.

629 B. F. Motz, Petitioner
vs.
Edward Kneel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Submitted for the petitioner.

631 Jacob Lander &c., Petitioner vs. Paul Klopstock &c. and

632 Louis Liebman et al. vs. Paul Klopstock &c.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Wade H. Ellis in behalf of Mr. E. A. Bigelow for the petitioners and by Mr. Arthur Mayer for the respondent.

637 The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Wilbur H. Mohney.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick W. Gaines and Mr. John H. Doyle for the petitioner and by Mr. Albert H. Miller and Mr. A. J. Miller, for the respondents.

639 Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company et al., Petitioners vs. Fred Ward.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the

of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Sidney C. Rabinowitz, Mr. L. J. Roberts, Mr. ~~C. C. Blake~~ Mr. W. H. Bruce, Mr. Thomas F. Littlepage and Mr. W. E. Dickinson, for the petitioners and by Mr. G. T. Pendleton for the respondent.

410 Life Preserver Suit Company, Inc., Petitioner
vs.
National Life Preserver Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James A. Hamill in behalf of Mr. Edward E. McCall for the petitioner and by Mr. W. Brooke Cochran for the respondent.

413 Joseph Cohen, Petitioner
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Samuel Marcus and Mr. Frank Moss for the petitioner and by Mr. Morton C. Lewis and Mr. Alfred J. Becker for the respondents.

Samuel J. Rosenthal et al. The petition for

Tuesday October 8th 1918 continued.

646
vs.
The United States of America.

The cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles B. Stafford for the petitioner.

The New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
647
vs.
Kathryn G. Kimball.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Maurice C. Spratt for the petitioner and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Louisiana Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
648
vs.
Oyster Commission of Louisiana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. C. Gilmore, Mr. Thomas Gilmore and Mr. Edward Nicholls Rightor, for the petitioner.

Aleck Crocker et al.,
Trustees &c., Petitioners
649
vs.

The petition for for a writ of

John F. Malley,
Collector of Internal
Revenue.

was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George A. King in behalf of Mr. Felix Rackemann for the petitioner.

651

Paul H. King & Dudley
E. Watson, Receivers &c.,
Petitioners
vs.
Edwin L. Boyd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John C. Shields and Mr. Henry E. Bodman for the petitioners and by Mr. Benn M. Corwin for the respondent.

653

Ana Maria Sugar Company, Inc.
Petitioner,
vs.
Thomas Quinones.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger for the petitioner.

654

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
William N. [illegible]

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the con-

Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Robt Lamb, Mr. C. E. McKenzie and Mr. W. W. Wolfe for the petitioner and by Mr. C. H. Kittrell for the respondent.

655 La Crosse Plow Company, Petitioner, vs. Louis Pagenstecher. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Burt E. Leske on behalf of Mr. Charles W. Bunn for petitioner and by Mr. William F. Bailey for respondent.

656 Leo Weidhorn, Petitioner, vs. Benjamin A. Levy, Trustee, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lucas P. Loring on behalf of Mr. Walter Hartstone for the petitioner and by Mr. Lee M. Friedman for the respondent.

657 Camp Brothers & Company, Petitioner, vs. Portable Wagon Dump & Elevator Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of

printed arguments by Mr. William R. Harr in behalf of Mr. Albert N. Graves for the petitioner and by Mr. H. H. Bliss for the respondent.

660 Southern Pacific Company, Claimant &c., et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Stag Line, Limited, Claimant &c., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. M. Tebbetts in behalf of Mr. J. Parker Kirlin for the petitioners and by Mr. William B. Lockhart for the respondents.

662 Alaska Steamship Company, Petitioner
vs.
National Carbon Company

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Harrison Gray Platt, Mr. Henry Crofut White, and Mr. Robert Treat Platt for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the respondent.

The Yazoo & Mississippi

The petition fo

668 et al., Petitioners
vs.
Philip S. Conrig et al.,
Executors, &c.

herein was submitted to the Court on printed argument by Mr. Thomas A. Evans in behalf of Mr. Charles W. Bunn and Mr. H. L. Minor for the petitioners.

672 The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York,
Petitioner
vs.
Clarence P. Howland Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken and Mr. Merton E. Lewis, for the petitioner and by Mr. Andrew J. Nellis for the respondents.

673 The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York,
Petitioner
vs.
Johnson Lighterage Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken and Mr. Merton E. Lewis for the petitioner

74

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
vs.
Rock Plaster Manufacturing Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken and Mr. Merton E. Lewis for the petitioner.

75

Piedmont & George's Creek Coal Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Seaboard Fisheries Company, Claimant, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. W. M. Tibbetts in behalf of Mr. J. Parker Kirlin, Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. D. B. Tucker, Jr., for the petitioner and by Mr. Royall Victor for the respondent.

76

Charles H. Rice,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on [illegible]

Tuesday, October 8th 1918 continued.

William Shaw McCalden for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday October 14th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened:

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, it is ordered that John T. Gose, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. E. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Homer L. Peeke, Esquire, of Sandusky, State of Ohio be admitted to

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, it is ordered that Austin M. Cowan, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas and James W. Challiss, Esquire, of Atchison, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe Henry Eagle, it is ordered that Clifford Price, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas be admitted as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. B. G. McPartlands, it is ordered that Frank Vernon Abel, of Martinsburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mack [illegible], it is ordered that James I. Palmer, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be ad-counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that William S. Hogsett, Esquire, of Kansas City Mo. Mont T. Prewitt, Esquire, of Kansas City and Mr. Jno. T. Davis, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas D. McKeown it is ordered that Clinton O. Bunn Esquire of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. H. N. Low, it is ordered that Samuel R. Kenworthy Esquire of Rock Island, and John T. Kenworthy, Esquire, of Rock Island State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in

that John Emerson Bennett, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. P. Thomas, it is ordered that Emmet S. Hughes, Esquire, of Montgomery, and S. Lloyd Tate, Esquire, of Wetumpka, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, it is ordered that Joseph L. Pepper, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

1022 of October Term, 1917.

Clinton H. Price, Angelo Caro, Charles Z. Zeitman and Charles Wilson,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition to set aside order docketing and dismissing and to docket and submitted by Mr. Justice behalf of Mr. Frederick A. Wake for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, with leave to Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd to submit a memorandum in regard thereto.

130 Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Tonopah & Tidewater Railroad Company.

217 Western Union Telegraph Company, Appellant,
vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
and

1011 Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Appellant,
vs.
Chicago Great Western Railroad Company.

in No. 130.

The motion to consolidate for hearing in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the plaintiff in error in no. 130 and the appellant

288 Lewis McCrea, Appellant,
vs.

This cause was submitted to the

the Court on the second and further arguments by Mr. Henry B. Moore on behalf of Mr. Robert J. Smith for the appellant and by Mr. Orrin Britt Brown for the appellee.

615

County of Rock Island and Paul H. Lorenz, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Edmund M. Dunne, Catholic Bishop &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. Kenworthy and Mr. George L. Wright for the defendant in error in support of the same and by Mr. C. J. Searle for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

10, Orig.

The State of South Dakota, Complainant,
vs.
Charles B. Collins.

On motion of Mr. Samuel Herrick of counsel for the Complainant leave is hereby granted to file, open and publish the testimony herein.

544

Daniel McPhillips et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. O. Mitchell and Helen E. Mitchell.

The motion for an extension of time in which to file printed [illegible] answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. P. Mason in behalf of Mr. Milton Brown for the plaintiffs in error.

164 The United States et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company et al.

165 The United States et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company et al.

166 The United States et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company et al.

On motion of Mr. H. H. White for the appellees it is ordered that these cases be re-assigned for argument on Monday, December 9th next.

580 [illegible] F. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
vs.
Harry Moore et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and motion to complete record in this cause was submitted to the con

Mitchell, pro se.

9 Orig. State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The stipulation for judgment herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank W. McAllister for the complainant.

449 Allanwilde Transport Corporation vs. Vacuum Oil Company. and

450 Allanwilde Transport Corporation, vs. A. W. Pidwell.

The motion to advance herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument made by Mr. Walter M. [illegible] in behalf of counsel.

262 The Bank of California, National Association, Plaintiff in error, vs. Friend William Richardson as Treasurer of the State of California.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the motion and printed argument made by Mr.

[illegible]

by Mr. P. W. Meldrim, Mr. Oscar Sutro, and Mr. Alfred Sutro for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. Raymond Benjamin for the defendant in error.

524 Western Union Telegraph Company, Appellant, vs. The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. Henry L. Stone and Mr. Henry L. Peoples in support of the same and by Mr. William L. Clay and Mr. Rush Taggart in opposition thereto.

380 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Alabama.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. E. Perry Thomas, Mr. Henry L. Stone and Mr. George W. Jones for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. R. C. Brickell and Mr. Emmett S. Thigpen for the defendant in error.

Rob. E. Lasater

The petition for a

658 vs. Magnolia Petroleum Company et al. — herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of Mr. W. E. Pope for the petitioner with leave to file printed papers within twenty days.

498 Houston Oil Company of Texas et al., Petitioners, vs. The State of Texas et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William L. Marbury in behalf of Mr. Thomas M. Kennerly and Mr. R. C. Hood for the petitioners.

535 Louis A. Meyran, Petitioner, vs. J. A. Nutt, Trustee, &c. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Macrum for the petitioner.

550 The Union Savings Bank & Trust Company of Cincinnati, Trustee, — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein

George Buck et al.: To the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. E. R. King and Mr. Malcolm [illegible] for the petitioners and by Mr. H. L. Peake for the respondents.

634 The Estate of P. D. Beckwith, Inc., Petitioner,
vs.
The Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of this Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harry C. Howard for the petitioner.

630 J. S. [illegible] and J. B. Blanchard,
Appellants,
vs.
[illegible] Lumber & Land Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. S. [illegible] Jr. in behalf of Mr. Mark H. Irwin and Mr. J. A. [illegible] for the appellants in support of the petition and by Mr. C. [illegible] Shields and Mr. A. Hall [illegible] for the appellee in opposition thereto.

New Orleans Mobile & [illegible]

Petitioner

vs.

645 Hill Manufacturing Company.

was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. N. Flowers for the petitioner and by Mr. Francis S. Laws for the respondent.

Boston & Albany Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

665 vs.

Charles J. Bjornquist, by his next friend, Alfred Wiggin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry for the petitioner and by Mr. Bernard J. Killion and Mr. Charles Doye for the respondent.

Postal Telegraph Cable Company,

Petitioner

671 vs.

J. L. Nickerson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Seymour E. Hinton on behalf of Mr. J. W. [illegible] for the petitioner.

Monday October 14th 1918, continued.

53 The State of Louisiana,
Petitioner
vs
New Orleans Land Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Winans Wall, Mr. James Clark Henriques and Mr. H. C. Moise for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles Louque and Mr. W. O. Hart for the respondent.

Order:

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore assigned for argument on this day be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, the 21st instant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday next at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present;

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices;
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal;
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Barrett Riddle, it is ordered that Harry A. Hickey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, Carl F. Boesler, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, and Mark J. St. John, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger it is ordered that Ralph E. Day, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight S. Taylor, it is ordered that Chester R. Lacy, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, and W. H. Larue, Esquire, of Madera, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Jacob Rogers it is ordered that Arthur J. Eno, Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, it is ordered that James Cunning, Esquire, of Baker, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. T. Ansberry it is ordered that Harry C. McMichael of Cali-

Dayton, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Allen it is ordered that Harlan Read, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright it is ordered that Clyde Raymond Yates, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that Charles Sumner Kimmay Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Sessions it is ordered that Burt Ohmer Gardner Esquire, of Colorado State of qualifications as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

35

Red Jacket Jr. Coal Company and Hickman Pepper, George Wharton Pepper and Hickman B. Waite, Appellants,
vs.
United Thacker Coal Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

544

Samuel McPhillips, R. L. Phillips, N. E. Wicht, and Otto Muck,
Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
H. C. Mitchell and Helen E. Mitchell.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

Mr

transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

—Orig'l. Ex parte: In the matter of Whitney Steamboat Corporation, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

—Orig'l. Ex parte: In the matter of Whitney Steamboat Corporation, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York and Judge Edwin L. Garvin and all other judges and officers of said Court before

City of Washington on Monday, November 4th 1918, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Charles W. Baer, Petitioner. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

202. Southern Oregon Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. On consideration of the joint motion of appellant and appellee for leave to file a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Oregon for an order granting leave to sell certain timber,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company. On considera- tion of the

239 vs.
Oreste da Vella, Royal Italian Consul, as Administrator, &c.

for leave to amend statement of points relied on and for leave to print additional part of the transcript of record herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

305 Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Henry L. Bogart et al., Executors, &c., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the several petitions for leave to intervene in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

347 John E. Read, Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

98 Rebecca Linn, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Kennedy.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause is assigned for argument on Monday, December 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

08 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Homer Gudger.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

664

The Hebe Company, et al., Appellants,
vs.
Norman E. Shaw Secretary of Agriculture of Ohio et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday December 9th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

556

Duplex Printing Press Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Emil J. Deering and William Bramley, individually and as Business Agents of District No. 15 of the International Association of Machinists.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

472

Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Albert H. Smith

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

485

William Kinzell,
Petitioner
vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

507
to
515

E. B. Spiller,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, and many other railroad com-

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari in-

and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

442. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Alice Duncan Brown et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

454. Hubbard Zemurray Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Aktieselskabet Stavangeren.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United

Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company,
Petitioner
459
vs.
Edwin Hale Abbott.

Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company,
Petitioner
460
vs.
Edwin Hale Abbott.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Columbia-Knickerbocker
Trust Company, Petitioner,

Preston B. Keith.
and
Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company
Petitioners
462
vs.
Preston B. Keith

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same: it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company,
Petitioner
463
vs.
John S. Ames.
and
Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company,
Petitioner
464
vs.
John S. Ames.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration

writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

465 Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner, vs. Maria A. Evans Executrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

466 Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner,

vs.

Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company,
Petitioner,
467. vs.
George E. Keith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company,
Petitioner
468 vs.
Mary C. Cordingley
and
Columbia Knickerbocker Trust Company,
Petitioner
469 vs.
Mary C. Cordingley.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

470 Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
R. Lathrop Ames.

471 Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Company, Petitioner,
vs.
R. Lathrop Ames.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

477

Stanley Pollock,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

478

Black Mountain Railway Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Lena Mumpower, Administratrix, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

83 Union Tool Company, Petitioner
vs.
Elihu C. Wilson.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

481 Union Tool Company et al., Petitioners
vs.
Wilson & Willard Manufacturing Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

488

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
William C. Gallagher, as Guardian of Anna L. Garrity, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

489

Gulfport Towing Company, Claimant, &c., Petitioner,
vs.
The Ottinger & Bruce Dry Dock Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

190 Claude A. Weiss, Petitioner vs. Lauter Piano Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

445 J. Harry King, Petitioner vs. Paul R. Rhodes. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

518 Lawrence R. Connolly,
Administrator of the Estate
of John Corbett, deceased
et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Celia Diamond and William Diamond and Bridget
McGrail and John McGrail.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

503 Herbert E. Edmunds
vs. Petitioner
The United States of America

On petition for writ of

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Grand Rapids & Indiana Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

520

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that this petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that section 3 of Rule 22 of the Rules of Practice of this Court be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

3. One hour on each side will be allowed for the argument, and no more, without special leave of the Court granted before the argument begins. But in cases certified from the Circuit Court of Appeals, cases involving solely the jurisdiction of the court below and cases under the Act of March 2, 1907, 34 Stat., 1246, forty five minutes only on each side will be allowed for the argument unless the time be extended. The time thus allowed may be apportioned between the counsel on the same side at their discretion; provided always, that a fair opening of the case shall be made by the party having the opening and closing arguments.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

113	Frank Nicoulin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John J. O'Brien.	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and

ment assigned to the 20th inst. by Mr. Augustus E. Willson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. [illegible] for the defendant in error.

5 International Harvester Company of New Jersey (formerly International Harvester Company) et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, on consideration of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

19 Joseph Holt Gist, Master of Rose Lodge, et al., Appellants, vs. Supreme Lodge Knights of Pythias.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a

dismiss this appeal has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

103

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Cassius L. Glasgow, Lawton T. Hemans, Charles S. Cunningham et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

110

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error

In error to the Supreme Court of Ap-

William L. Whitehurst. State of Virginia

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Wherefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed, each party paying his own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arthur A. Bonvillain, Petitioner, vs. W. E. Howell, Trustee of Arthur A. Bonvillain, Bankrupt. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Wherefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

133 H. S. McGowan, John McGowan, Charles McGowan, Erick Lindstrom and J. O. Coyle,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Eagle Cliff Fishing Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed:

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

257 Ada V. Cushing, Executrix of the Estate of Francis J. Cushing, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John A. Whaley, Mary E. Whaley, The American

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

80
Louisa B. Schneider
and Maud Pitt,
Petitioners
vs.
The City of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Martin J. St. John and Mr. Charles P. Brown for the petitioners and by Mr. William P. Burr for the respondents.

82
Bessie Revett nee
Offutt et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Charles B. Shaffer
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr.

R. Martin for the petitioners and by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser for the respondents.

700
Coleman J. Ward et al., Petitioners
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Emerson Bennett for the petitioners.

702
Nora Dinby, Petitioner
vs.
Mary E. Halliburton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of Mr. E. L. Fulton for the petitioner and by Mr. J. H. Everest for the respondent.

705
The Duluth Steamship Company, Petitioner
vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court ments by Mr. Frank S. Bright on behalf of Mr. Harvey W. Teasdale, Mr. Thomas A. Gerry and Mr. Chauncey C. Cotton for the petitioners.

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore assigned for argument on this day be, and the same are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, the 28th instant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, it is ordered that Karl Edmund Steinhauer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard L. Lawson, it is ordered that Allan H. Wagner, Esquire of Detroit State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, October 28th 1918, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Stryker, it is ordered that Maxwell McNutt, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California and Roy B. Thomson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that Alfred Franklin, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Niese, it is ordered that Frank B. Wickersham, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac R. Hitt, it is ordered that Benjamin Aslund, Esquire, of Albany, State of an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Shea, it is ordered that W. H. Hill, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Hanford, it is ordered that Geo. H. Korte, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence D. Laylin, it is ordered that Charles D. Pettit, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Stevenson, it is ordered that William W. Cummins, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of [illegible]

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson, it is ordered that Bernard F. Weadock, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

County of Rock Island
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Edmund M. Dunne,
Catholic Bishop of the
Diocese of Peoria.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State
of Illinois.

(615)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

1022 of October Term 1917.

Clinton H. Pierce et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to set aside the order docketing and dismissing the case and for leave to file the transcript of record and docket the case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and It is now here ordered that the mandate heretofore issued be, and the same is hereby, recalled.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

650

Ward F. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
vs.
Harry Mason et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

650

Ward F. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
vs.
Harry Mason et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to complete the transcript of record in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted without [illegible]

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Orig.

State of Missouri,
Complainant,
vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the stipulation of counsel for the respective parties that the judgment shall be entered in favor of the complainant and against the defendant in the sum of One thousand four hundred and twelve dollars and thirty-seven cents ($1,412.37) and the costs of this action and the sum of Three hundred dollars, ($300.00) as compensation for C. R. Hiter, Esquire, of Marshall, Missouri, appointed commissioner to take testimony in this cause by order made April 16th, 1917, and the sum of Seventy-five dollars (75.00) as compensation for James J. Rabick, employed by the commissioner as stenographer, for taking and transcribing testimony be taxed as costs herein and paid by defendant.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the complainant do recover of the defendant the said sum of One thousand four hundred and twelve dollars and thirty seven cents ($1,412.37) and the hundred dollars ($300.00) as compensation for such commissioner, and the sum of Seventy five dollars ($75.00) as compensation for said stenographer.

It is further ordered in pursuance of said stipulation, that the judgment be entered as satisfied as to said principal sum and said fees of commissioner and stenographer, the said sums having heretofore been paid by said defendant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

449 Allanwilde Transport Corporation, vs. Vacuum Oil Company, and

450 Allanwilde Transport Corporation, vs. A. W. Bidwell.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, December 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company,

Plaintiffs in error,
130 vs.
Norfolk & Tidewater Equipment Company.

The Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
217 vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.
and
Postal Telegraph Cable Company,
Appellant,
404 vs.
John W. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be assigned for argument on Monday, January 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

R. L. Lee,
Petitioner,
528 vs.
Central of Georgia Railway Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for

Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elizabeth Hull, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner
529
vs.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph Company
Petitioner
542
vs.
George M. Brown, Executor, &c., et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

567

Rederiaktiebolaget Atlanten, Petitioner,
vs.
Aktieselskabet Korn Og Foderstof Kompagniet

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George A. Cole et al.,

568

vs.
Joseph Ralph.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

569

George A. Cole et al., Petitioners
vs.
Joseph Ralph.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court

petition be, and the same is hereby granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

71

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Mrs. Lessie Horton, Administratrix, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

91

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
vs.
Susie Reynolds.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

614 Meccano, Limited,
Petitioner
vs.
John Wanamaker.
New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that this petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Board of Public
Utility Commissioners,
Petitioner

18 vs.
Ynchausti & Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

Consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Michael W. Boehmer, Petitioner,
19 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
637 vs.
Wilbur H. Mahoney.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company and A. J. Carney, Petitioners;
639 vs.
Ada Ward.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

653 Ana Maria Sugar Company, Inc., Petitioner vs. Tomas Quinones. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

656 Lee Hurthorn, Petitioner, vs. Benjamin A. Levy, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of J. Hiland Hurthorn, Bankrupt. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel in it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

671

Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Petitioner,
vs.
J. L. Nickerson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is, hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

675

Piedmont & Georges Creek Coal Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Seaboard Fisheries Company, Claimant &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, in support of it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

700

Coleman J. Ward et al., Petitioners vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Oklahoma.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is, hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

698

Houston Oil Company of Texas et al., Petitioners vs. The State of Texas et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of now ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

501

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Mary Ellen Long, Administratrix, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

530

North Michigan Water Company, Petitioner,
vs.
City of Escanaba et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, [illegible] support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

533
Gee Woe,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

535
Louis A. Magrane,
Petitioner
vs.
J. H. Hill, Trustee &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

550

The Union Savings Bank & Trust Company of Cincinnati, Trustee,
Petitioner
vs.
George Frick et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

552

River Sand and Gravel Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans, Claimant, &c, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

553 Jesse D. Warren, Petitioner,
vs.
Postal Telegraph-Cable Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

557 Charles W. Mayer,
Petitioner

A. & H. T. Mutschler et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

562. Newton Midkiff, Petitioner, vs. Sabin W. Colton, Jr., et al., Trustees &c. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

570

[illegible] Motor Car Company, et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Diedrich S. Elliott et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

573

Louis Matson et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the by denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David H. E. Jones and Howard E. Jones, co-partners, &c., et al., Petitioners vs. The United States of America upon the relation of Passprich & Sons Company.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

574

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had in support of as well as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice White.

575

David H. E. Jones and
Howard E. Jones, co-
partners, &c., et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of America upon the rela-
tion of Passchard &

Iron Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

579 Martha E. Whitaker, Individually and as Executrix &c., Petitioner, vs The Whitaker Iron Company, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alanna V. Browning,
Petitioner,
vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

582

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Ohio on the relation of The Midland Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Robert N. Langdale et al.

583

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

586 Nellie Hodge, as Administratrix &c., et al., Petitioners vs. Arthur L. Meyer et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

587 Ernest G. Walker, Petitioner vs. Lorenzo K. Fisk. — On petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Reichert Towing Line, Inc.,
Petitioner
vs.
588 Home Insurance Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Reichert Towing Line, Inc.,
Petitioner
589 vs.
Jacob Rice

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

590 William Snyder, Petitioner, vs. Annie Snyder to the use of William Stark. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners

Naomi Leggetten vert Schaff et al. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

594 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Edwin Hyams, Master, &c., | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by

said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

396 Clarence A. Dunn, Petitioner, vs. Allison & Webber Building Company, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

600 Frank W. Harting, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Newport News. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner
601 vs.
Panama Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

A. C. Robinson, Trustee &c., Petitioner
602 vs.
Seaboard National Bank of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

003

A. C. Robinson, Trustee, &c., Petitioner

vs.

J. H. Purdy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

004

A. C. Robinson, Trustee, &c., Petitioner

vs.

Edward W. Hutchinson and Henry Wheeler, Trustees, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United

Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

609

Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, Petitioner,
vs.
Mt. Clemens Sugar Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

610

Paul Hesse and Johan Kaltenhof, Petitioners,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

612 R. McCulloch Dick, Petitioner,
vs.
Anton Hohmann, Acting Chief of Police of Manila.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

83 The Montezuma Valley Irrigation District et

Mark Morris et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

621

John A. S. Brown and
Frank E. Schermerhorn
Trustee &c.,
Petitioners
vs.
Austin B. Fletcher as Testamentary Trustee of Conrad Morris Braker, &c.
and Conrad Morris
Braker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John W. Brown and
Frank E. Schermerhorn,
Trustee &c.,
Petitioners
522 vs.
Austin B. Fletcher as
Testamentary Trustee of
Conrad Morris Braker &c.,
and Conrad Morris
Braker.

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit
Court of Appeals
for the Second
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Toledo & Ohio
Central Railway
523 Company, Petitioner
vs.

On petition
for writ of cer-
tiorari to the
Supreme Court

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

626

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner
vs.
John E. Duthey and the Pennsylvania Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

627

Teresa A. De Prosse,
Petitioner
vs.
Robert A.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Ap-of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of Certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

29 B. F. Waitz, Petitioner, vs David Ross.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

30 J. W. Ferguson and J. C. Blanchard, Appellants, vs Babcock Lumber &

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here

Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

631

Jacob Lander doing business under the name of J. Lander
Petitioner
vs.
Paul Klopstock doing business under the name of Paul Klopstock & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louis Liebmann and Nathaniel Liebmann, co-partners, doing business under the firm name and style of Liebmann Brothers,
Petitioners

632 vs
Paul Klopstock, doing business under the name of Paul Klopstock & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Life Insurance Club Company, Inc.,
Petitioner
40 vs
Mutual Life Insurance Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup now ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Chief Justice White.

643

Joseph Cohen, Petitioner,
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

645

New Orleans, Mobile & Chicago Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Hill Manufacturing Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel J. Rosenthal
and Harry Himmelman
Petitioners
646 vs.
The United States of
America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York Central
Railroad Company,
Petitioner
647 vs.

as Administratrix of the Estate of Nathan C. Kimball, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

651 Paul H. King and Dudley E. Waters, Receivers of the Pere Marquette Railroad Company, Petitioners

vs.

Edwin L. Boyd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner
684 vs.
William H. Mehlal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Richland County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Richland County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

La Crosse Plow Company, Petitioner
685 vs.
Frank Pagenstecher.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

657 Camp Brothers & Company, Petitioner, vs. Portable Wagon Dump & Elevator Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Pacific Com-

Steamship "El Monte"
and Cargo, and Na-
tional Surety Company,
Petitioners,

560 vs.

Stag Line, Limited, claim-
ant of Steamship "Clema-
tis" and Commission for
Relief in Belgium.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alaska Steamship Com-
pany,
Petitioner,

662 vs.

National Carbon Com-
pany.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

665 Boston & Albany Railroad Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Charles J. Bjornquist by his next friend, Alfred Wiggin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

568 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al.
Petitioners
vs.
Philip S. Craig, Robert Craig and H. C. Craig, Executors, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

572 The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York,
Petitioner
vs.
Warren T. Howland Company, Inc., and Massachusetts Bonding and Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department, State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a

State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

673

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York, Petitioners,
vs.
Johnson Lighterage Company and Employers Liability Assurance Corporation, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court Appellate Division Third Judicial Department of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State Industrial
Commission of the State
of New York,
Petitioner,
vs.
Rock Plaster Manu-
facturing Company
and Employers' Liability
Assurance Corporation,
Ltd.

674

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the Supreme
Court, Appellate
Division, Third
Judicial De-
partment, of the
State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles H. Rice,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of
America.

676

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit
Court of Appeals
for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louise B. Schneider
and Ward Petty,
Petitioners,
680 vs.
The City of New York
and The Comptroller
of the City of New York.

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the Supreme
Court of the
State of New
York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dora Finley,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
Mary E. Hillebrandt.

On petition
for writ of certi-
orari to the
United States
Circuit Court
of Appeals for
the Eighth

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

705 The Duluth Steamship Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

415 Abraham L. Sugarman, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

Monday, October 23rd 1916, continued.

437
Charles F. Schunck,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America,

438
Elizabeth Barr,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;
and
548
Conrad Kornmann,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. J. Carroll Todd for the United States.

376
William B. Bates,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America,

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the Dist

Southern District of New York and Mr Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

per Mr Chief Justice White.

Camp Bird, Limited
Petitioner

21. vs.

Harry H. Howbert, as Collector of Internal Revenue within and for the District of Colorado.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and Mr Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the respondent having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the

It is, therefore in pursuance of such confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

719 Clarence W. Turner, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Old Homestead Company et al.

Mr. John J. Shea for the defendants in error having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

I, William M. Franklin, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein Clarence W. Turner, Clarence W. Turner Jr., Marion R. Turner, J. A. Kirkwood, Effie R. Kirkwood, Mary Kirkwood, a minor, and Raymond Kirkwood said Metropolitan Trust Company, a corporation, and Dorah A. Bigg were plaintiffs in error and The Old Homestead Company, a corporation, Paul E. Dunn, Sarah B. Dunn, James M. Givens and John A. Dunn were defendants in error, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the eighth day of January 1918, in favor of the said defendants and against the said plaintiffs in error, and that on the ninth day of July, A. D. 1918, said plaintiffs in error sued out a writ of error to said Supreme Court directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, this 2 day of October A. D. 1918.

< Seal >

Wm M. Franklin
Clerk.
by Neal Orr,
Ass't."

and moved the court to docket and dismiss the cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiffs in error have failed to have with the rules of this Court.

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

666 Detroit United Railway, Appellant, vs. City of Detroit.

The motion to advance or for an injunction pending the hearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson, Mr. John C. Donnelly, Mr. William L. Carpenter, Mr. P. J. M. Hally and Mr. Bernard F. Weadock for the appellant, and by Mr. Richard I. Lawson for the appellee.

15 E. W. Bliss Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.

Monday, October 28th 1918, continued.

6. The United States, Appellant, vs. E. W. Bliss Company.

On motion of Mr. Ely J. Bliss in behalf of counsel it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 rule 26.

86 Maurice Sugar, Petitioner, vs. The United States.
and
87 Maurice Sugar, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Willis G. Clarke in that behalf leave is hereby granted to withdraw the appearance of P. J. M. Hally as counsel for the petitioner in these causes.

60 Albert Palmer et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Ohio.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Clarence D. Laylin and Mr. Frank Davis Jr., for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. John Thomas and Mr. J. K. Raushbaugh for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Monday, October 28th 1918 continued.

715

The Columbus Railway,
Power & Light Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The City of Columbus, Ohio,
et al.

The motion to advance the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

printed argument by Mr. Joseph S. Clark, for the appellant.

352.

Deschutes Railroad
Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Eastern Oregon Land
Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer and Mr. James G. Wilson for the appellant in opposition thereto.

479

International Paper
Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Schooner Gracie
D. Chambers, &c.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

Richard Snyder, on behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

34 The Southwestern Telegraph & Telephone Company, Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The City of Houston, Texas.

Error to the Court of Civil Appeals of the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

623 Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
J. J. Gray.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John B. Cooke in behalf of Mr

Mr. Wallace M. [illegible] and Mr. [illegible] H. Merrick for the respondent.

678	S. W. Mills as Trustee &c., Petitioner vs. C. M. [illegible] Company.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

printed arguments by Mr. E. C. [illegible] being in behalf of Mr. [illegible] E. Yates for the Petitioner.

686	Marine Sugar, Petitioner vs. The United States of America;	The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter D. Clark for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd.
	and	
687	Marine Sugar, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.	

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. W. C. Herron, for the respondent.

The Barber Asphalt

691 Petitioner
vs.
William H. Burkhardt
et als

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Charles J. Sturtevant on behalf of Mr. Joseph W. Bailey and Mr. Harry W. Peale for the petitioner and by Mr. George A. Ward for the respondents.

103 Samuel W. Maynard
Petitioner
vs.
Walter G. Reynolds
and Thomas B. Harlan partners, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Roy B. Thomson, Mr. D. A. Dean and Mr. N. M. Langworthy for the petitioner.

117 Alonzo Stuart
et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
John E. Stumpf
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. E. Haymond for the petitioners.

6199

Order:

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore assigned for argument on this day be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, November 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, November 4th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by the Honorable Thomas Watt Gregory, Attorney General of the United States, it is ordered that Leslie C. Garnett, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that Max Kahn, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michi and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Long it is ordered that Thomas S. Salathiel, Esquire, of Independence, State of Kansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Frank Ernest Green, Esquire, of Seattle and Diedrick H. Stewart, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. N. Bogert, it is ordered that Jesse Fuller, Jr. Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Price Scott, it is ordered that Thomas [illegible] of Aberdeen, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

25	Watts, Watts & Company, Limited Petitioner vs. Unione Austriaca di Navigazione, &c.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Brandeis.

28 Pittsburgh Melting Company, Appellant, vs. G. E. Totten, Inspector of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

321 Western Union Telegraph Company, Appellant, vs.

[illegible]

ville Railroad Company. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

57 The Zanesville & Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles E. Williams, Administrator of the Estate of William Coster, deceased.

In error to the Court of Appeals of Muskingum County, State of Ohio.

This cause comes on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of Muskingum County, State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now

that the writ of error in this cause, be the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

457 The Zanesville & Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles E. Williams, Administrator of the Estate of William Corder, deceased.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

380 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Alabama.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby

missed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Deschutes Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Eastern Oregon Land Company.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

332.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

179

International Paper Company, Petitioner, vs. The Schooner Gracie D. Chambers, &c.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be

and the same is hereby granted, and

Monday, December 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

666 Detroit United Railway, Appellant, vs. City of Detroit.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 9th next at the head of the call for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

345 Abraham L. Sugarman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America;

437 Charles T. Schenck, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America;

438 Elizabeth Baer, Plaintiff in Error, vs.

Monday November 4th 1918, continued:

The United States of America ~

Ernest Kassmann, Plaintiff in Error,

518 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Columbus Railway, Power & Light Company, Appellant,

715 vs.

The City of Columbus, Ohio, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

381

The Estate of P. D. Beckwith, Inc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

619

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
vs.
John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

082. Bessie Privett, nee Griffith, P. B. Privett and John O. Whitehill, Petitioners vs. Charles B. Shaffer and H. J. Rowland.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

825 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Petitioner vs. J. J. Gray	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and of the argument of counsel [illegible] in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

(per Mr. Chief Justice White)

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
523 vs.
The Atlanta & West Point Railroad Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
524 vs.
The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Western Union Telegraph
Company,
Appellant,
323
vs
The Nashville Chattanooga
& St Louis Railway,

On considera-
tion of the
petition for
a writ of
certiorari herein,
It is now here
ordered by the Court that the said petition
be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph
Company,
Petitioner
58
vs.
Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Company.

On petition
for writ of
certiorari to the
United States
Circuit Court
of Appeals
for the
Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

621

The Cudahy Packing Company, Petitioner,

vs.

William K. Bixby, Frederic W. Delano and Edward B. Pryor, Receivers of the Wabash Railway, Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

648

Louisiana Navigation Company, Petitioner,

vs.

Oyster Commission of Louisiana et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of ment of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
83 vs.
New Orleans Land
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

S. T. Hills, as Trustee
in Bankruptcy of
The Natatorium Company, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
78 vs.
C. W. Simmons Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

686 Maurice Sugar, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America; On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

687 Maurice Sugar, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America; On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Monday, November 4th 1918, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel R. Maynard, Petitioner	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
103 vs.	
Walt Reynolds and Thomas D. Harlan, partners doing business as Reynolds & Harlan.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] [illegible], Guardian ad litem for [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and	On petition for a writ of certiorari to

717

vs.	
John S. Stump, v. American Baptist Home Mission Society et al.	States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth, Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order:

It is ordered by the Court that Section 3 of Rule 37 of the Rules of Practice of this Court be amended so as to read as follows:

[illegible]

Monday, November 4th 1918, continued.

606 Occidental Construction Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson in behalf of Mr. Solicitor General Davis for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles [illegible] for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

92 Atkinson & Rawlings Investment Company, Petitioner, vs. A. B. Allen, United States Collector, &c.

The motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson in behalf of Mr. E. Carroll Todd and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

Jacob Abrams, Samuel Lipman, Hyman Rosansky, Hyman Lachowsky and Mollie Steimer.

No —

vs.

The United States of America.

The motion to compel plaintiffs in error to take was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Weinberger for the plaintiffs in error with leave to counsel for the defendant in error to file opposition within four days.

290

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

Stoddard Lumber Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward C. Baldwin on behalf of Mr. W. Lee Thompson for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

491

Oklahoma Operating Company,

Appellant,

vs.

J. E. Love, et al., etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel for the Appellant.

Monday, November 4th 1918, continued:

1 The Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St Louis Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Allen J. Rusk.

On motion of Mr. F. H. McKenney for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered that this cause be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to provisions of Section 9, Rule 26.

16 John C. Madden,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. M. Probst.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Stephen H. Allen for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Joseph M. Stark for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

33 J. P. Lay, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
R. C. Lay, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William H. Wilkins for the defendant in error in support of for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

375 Charles B. Shaffer,
Appellant,
vs
E. B. Howard, State
Auditor, &c, et al.

It is ordered that this case be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, Rule 26, per stipulation of counsel.

523 Western Union Telegraph
Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Atlanta & West Point
Railroad Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Sidney R. Prince in behalf of Mr. [illegible] McDaniel and Mr. [illegible] Hall for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. William L. Clay and Mr. Rush Taggart for the appellant in opposition thereto.

692 Altheimer & Rawlings
Investment Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
E. B. Allen, U.S. Collector, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward Goldsmith for the petitioner and by Mr. Garrett [illegible] and Mr. H. L. Nixon for the respondent.

James D. Bishop, Administrator, &c., et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Great Lakes Towing Company.

109 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry H. Stambaugh for the petitioners and by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, Mr. Thomas H. Garry, Mr. James H. Wilkerson, and Mr. Edwin H. Cassels for the respondent.

Pittsburgh Coal Company of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner
vs.
Great Lakes Towing Company.

110 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harrison Musgrave and Mr. William B. Crispenbaker for the petitioner and by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, Mr. Thomas H. Garry, Mr. James H. Wilkerson and

Monday, November 4th 1918, continued

Mr. Edwin H. Cassels for the respondent.

Northwestern Electric Equipment Company, Petitioner,
726 vs.
Benjamin Electric Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Eugene A. Brown in behalf of Mr. Frederick H. Winter for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Clyde Jones for the respondent.

Gulf Oil Corporation, Petitioner,
310 vs.
C. F. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

This cause was argued by Mr. William A. Seifert, for the petitioner and by Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Appellant,
212 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. H. Hanford for the appellant and by Mr.

Assistant Attorney General

appellees.

33 The United States of America, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edmund W. [illegible] et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General [illegible] for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. Charles W. [illegible] for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, November 5th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], it is ordered that G. A. Wellrich, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible] S. Jackson it is ordered that Vernon W. Lindsay, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, him as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Louisiana ex rel.
Willis J. Roussel, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
1 vs.
Jared Y. Sanders, Governor
et al.

The death of Willis J. Roussel the plaintiff in error herein having been suggested and the appearance of Wilhelmine G. Schmidt, widow of Willis J. Roussel deceased, and testamentary executrix of his succession having been filed and entered, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Wilhelmine G. Schmidt widow, etc., be and she is hereby made the party plaintiff in error in this cause.

The State of Louisiana
ex rel Wilhelmine G.
Schmidt, widow &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
1 vs.
Jared Y. Sanders,
Governor et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Wilhelmine G. Schmidt, widow &c., plaintiff in error pro se, and by Mr. Henry Gamble

Tuesday, November 5th 1918, continued.

235 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward M. Cronyn et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. A. Hagner for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the plaintiff in error. Leave granted defendants to file additional brief within ten days.

361 John Dillon vs. Strathearn Steamship Company, Claimant, &c.

—

392 Erik Sandberg et al., Petitioners, vs. John McDonald, Claimant of the British ship "Talus";

—

393 Paul Neilson et al., Petitioners, vs. Rhine Shipping Company, claimant, &c.; and John Neeley et al.

394 vs.
Shepard & Morse Lumber Company, Claimant, etc.

Leave was granted to Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown to argue orally on behalf of the United States in these causes.

The argument in these causes was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the United States; continued by Mr. Alex T. Howard for the petitioners in 392, by Mr. Palmer Pillans for the respondent in No. 392; by Mr. H. J. Waguespack for petitioner in No. 361 and petitioners in No. 392, by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, for the respondents in Nos. 393 and 394 and concluded by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for petitioner in No. 361 and petitioners in Nos. 393 & 394 and submitted on printed arguments by Mr. Ralph James M. Bullowa for Luckenbach Steamship Company, claimant &c., in No. 361, and by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert as amicus curiae in No. 361.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
397

The argument of this cause was commenced

6072

Tuesday, November 5th 1918, continued.

General Duncan for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, November 6th 1918

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Colston, it is ordered that Washington T. Porter, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. S. Worthington, it is ordered that Stuart Mc Salisbury

C. Yager, Esquire, of Coachella, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

357 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Dan Hill.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

277 The Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al., Appellants, vs. John M. Landon as Receiver of the Kansas Natural Gas Company,

329 Kansas City, Missouri et al., Appellants, vs. John M. Landon, Receiver etc., et al.;

Kansas City Gas Company, et al.,
Appellants,
330 vs.
Kansas Natural Gas Company, et al.;
and
The Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al.,
Appellants,
353 vs.
John M. Landon, as receiver, etc., et al.

Three hours was allowed for the argument of these causes on motion of Mr. F. S. Jackson in that behalf.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. F. S. Jackson for the Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al., continued by Mr. Robert Stone for Landon receiver; by Mr. James B. Lindsay for Public Service Commission of Missouri, by Mr. A. F. Smith for Kansas City, Missouri; by Mr. Chester I. Long, for Landon receiver; and by Mr. Charles Blood Smith for Fidelity Title & Trust Company, and concluded by Mr. J. W. Dana for Kansas City Gas Company, et al.

Emanuel Baltzer et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

Wednesday, November 6th, 1918 continued.

321	The United States of America; and William J. Head, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.	The argument in these cases was commenced by Mr. Jos. Kirby for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, November 7th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian it is ordered that Alfred Bettman, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward

Peck, Esquire of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Taggart it is ordered that Michael Joseph Gernon, Esquire, of Russell, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

10 H. C. King, Plaintiff in Error, vs The Putnam Investment Company. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lee Monroe for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. B. I. Litowich for the defendant in error.

12. Stephen H. Allen, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs J. A. Plummer as Treasurer of the County

of Garvin in the State of Oklahoma. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and the plaintiffs in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute the writ of error in this cause and failing to appear, it is thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court and on motion of Mr. S. P. Freeling of counsel for the defendant in error, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Emanuel Baltzer,
Plaintiff in Error,
20 vs
The United States of America.
and

321

William J. Head,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Joe Kirby for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Joe Kirby for the plaintiff in error.

21 Orig^l

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
vs.
The Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway and The Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. William A. Wimbish for the complainant and by Mr. Edward Colston for the defendants.

218

Guerini Stone Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
P. J. Carlin Construction Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward S. Paine for the Petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday November 8th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol:

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices,
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that John P. Ryle, Esquire, of St Paul, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrian Riker it is ordered that Richard Hartshorne, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey

Friday, November 8th 1918 continued.

admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

18 City of Birmingham, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. J. O'Connell.

It is ordered that this cause be continued to the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

18. Guarini Stone Company, Petitioner, P. J. Carlin Construction Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John C. Wait for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Edward S. Paine for the petitioner.

378 W. C. Sterrett as Receiver, &c., Petitioner vs Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edmund H. Kreyer for the petitioner and by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York,

3 Orig'l.
vs
State of New Jersey
et al.

Three hours were allowed to each side for the argument of this cause, on motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes in that behalf. The argument in the cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the complainants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, November 11th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at The Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day.
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Saul Zielonka: it is ordered that William Jerome Kuertz, Esquire, and Charles B. Weber, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of Louisiana
ex rel. Wilhelmine G.
Schmidt, et

1. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jared Y. Sanders, Governor, et als.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

369. John C. Madden, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. M. Forbes.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel;

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed

the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

523 Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
vs
The Atlanta & West Point Railroad Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

290 Oregon Washington Railroad & Navigation Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
Stoddard Lumber Co.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon and motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No —

Jacob Abrams, Samuel Lipman, Hyman Rosansky, Hyman Lachowsky and Mollie Steimer
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America

On consideration of the motion to admit the plaintiffs in error in this cause to bail,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said plaintiffs in error be admitted to bail in the sum of Ten thousand dollars ($10,000.00) each, conditioned according to law to be approved by one of the Judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

191 The Oklahoma Operating Company, Appellant, vs. J. E. Love et al., &c.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing at the same time as case No. 185 on the docket for the present term,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

366 Occidental Construction Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the disposition of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause in the regular call of the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Minerals Separation, Limited, Minerals Separation American Syndicate, Limited, and Minerals Separation

599 tion, Petitioner

vs.

Butte & Superior Mining Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

691 The Barber Asphalt Paving Company, Petitioner,

vs.

William H. Woerheide and Kant Leak Kleet Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

192 Althimer & Rawlings Investment Company, Petitioner, vs. E. P. Allen, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

04 James A. Bishop, Administrator of Susie C. Plamondon, et al., Petitioners, vs. Great Lakes Towing

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United

Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

710 Pittsburgh Coal Company of Illinois, Petitioner, vs. Great Lakes Towing Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

426 Northwestern Electric Equipment Company, Petitioner, vs. Benjamin Electric Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

46 The Cincinnati Traction Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Cincinnati.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Saul Zielonka, Mr. William Jerome Kuertz and Mr. Charles A. Weber for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Joseph Wilby and Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Monday, November 11th 1918 continued.

713 The Bunnan Construction Company, Petitioner, vs. John L. Nurbold.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George E. Sullivan and Mr. John J. Hamilton for the petitioner.

— Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Robert N. Thorburn, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the petitioner.

720 Thomas J. Mooney, Petitioner, vs. The People of the State of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. Maxwell McNutt for the petitioner and by Mr. C. M. Fickert for the respondent.

Metropolitan State Bank,

30 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that this is the second term at which this cause has been called for argument and that neither party is now prepared to argue the same it is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the plaintiff in error pursuant to the 19th rule of this Court.

Whereupon It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Francis A. Churchill
and Stewart Nait, co-
partners, doing business
under the firm name
& Style of the Mercantile
Advertising Agency,
Appellants & Plaintiffs in Error,

2 vs.

James F. Rafferty et al.

of the Philippine Islands.

Appeal from and in error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that this is the second term at which this cause has been called for argument, and that neither party is now prepared to argue the same, it is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the appellants and plaintiffs in error pursuant to the 19th rule of this Court.

Whereupon It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal and the writ of error in this cause be, and the same are hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of the
State of New York,
Complainants.
3 Orig. vs.
State of New Jersey
et al.

This argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the complain ants and by Mr. Adrian Ritter for the defendants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, November 12th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. McCarter it is ordered that John Howard Conover, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Bank of Oxford
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Er

Tuesday, November 12th 1918, continued.

35 vs
J. S. Love et al., Bank Examiners of the State of Mississippi.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be passed, per stipulation of counsel.

The People of the State of New York, Complainants,
3 Orig. vs
State of New Jersey, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Adrian Riker and Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the defendants and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, for the complainants.

Daniel J. Leary, Appellant,
3 vs.
The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Jersey City, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John M. Enright for the appellant and continued by Mr. Edward J. Stack for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, November 13th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, it is ordered that Albert Covington Mulaney, Esquire, of Bowling Green, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Vernon J. Casey

3 The Mayor and Alder men of the City of Jersey City, et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Edward P. Stout for the appellees.

7 The Buckeye Powder Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Company, et al.

Three hours and a half were allowed for the argument of this cause on motion of Mr. Wyman O. Abbott in that behalf.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Wyman O. Abbott for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. William S. Hilles and Mr. Frank S. Katzenbach, Jr., for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Wyman O. Abbott for the plaintiff in error.

8 Union Oil Company of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. R. Smith

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Lewis H. Andrews and Mr.

error with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file additional brief. No appearance filed for the defendant in error.

16 The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William P. Waggener and Mr. James M. Challis for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. James P. Coleman and Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler for the defendant in error.

17 Charles F. Ruddy, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Herman J. Rossi.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

19 Robert Miller and William Cooney, Plaintiffs in error, vs. B. O. McKnight

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the resumed and concluded argument by Mr. A. C. Evans for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Robert Stone, Mr. George T. McDermott and Mr. H. O. Caster for the defendant in error.

33 Clarence W. Turner,
Appellant
vs.
The United States and Creek Nation of Indians.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, November 14th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Matthew A. Dyke, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith it is ordered that of Twin Falls, State of Idaho be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Newman it is ordered that James K. Watts, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walt N. Wood it is ordered that Charles H. Stuart, Esquire, of Lafayette, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

43
W. N. Funk et al.,
Trustees &c.,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
The Board of County
Commissioners of
Muskogee County,
Oklahoma, et al.

It is ordered that this case be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 7, Rule 26, per stipulation of counsel.

33 Clarence W. Turner, Appellant, vs. The United States and Creek Nation of Indians.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the appellant and case submitted on printed argument by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson and Mr. George M. Anderson for the United States and by Mr. James C. Davis for the Creek Nation.

37 Abe Danciger et al., doing business as Danciger Brothers, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. T. Bentley.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff for the plaintiffs in error. No brief filed for the defendant in error.

40 Wells Fargo & Company, Plaintiff in error, vs The State of Nevada.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William E. Dunbar for the defendant

41 G. K. Henderson et al.,
Plaintiffs in error
vs.
Helen R. Kesson, or Helen R. Henderson et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. W. Prince for the plaintiffs in error and submitted on printed argument by Mr. H. M. Langworthy and Mr. W. A. Roach Jones for the defendants in error.

42 Chicago Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mary O'Connor, as Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. J. Killilea for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Eben R. Minahan for the defendant in error.

44 The United States,
Appellant
vs.
George B. Spearin;
and

45 George B. Spearin,
Appellant
vs.
The United States.

The argument in these causes was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, for Spearin.

Thursday, November 14th 1918 continued.

Proclamation being made, the Court was adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday November 15th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Martin, it is ordered that George Mason Dillard, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, quire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, it is ordered that Alfred S. Brown, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, it is ordered that John J. Sullivan, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Clarence S. Palmer, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, and William Moore, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Friday, November 15th 1918 continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland it is ordered that Otto C. Sommerich, Esquire, and Irving E. Burdick, Esquire, of New York City and James H. Douglas, Esquire of Seattle State of Washington be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

48 Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
A. M. Keels.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney of counsel for the plaintiff in error and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic Coast Line
Railroad Company,

48 vs. A. M. Keith. On motion of Mr. Duane R. McKinney it is now here ordered that the mandate in this cause be reissued.

54 Parson Son & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joe S. Bird, as County Treasurer of Shelby County, Alabama. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument, per stipulation of counsel by Mr. Giles William Lawrence Smith for the plaintiff in error. No brief filed for the defendant in error.

41 The United States, Appellant, vs. George B. Spearin, and

45 George B. Spearin, Appellant, vs. The United States. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Spearin by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson for the United States and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Spearin.

46 Edmund Penfold
et al. Executors etc.,
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Eugene M. Travis as
Comptroller of the
State of New York.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Mitchell for the Plaintiffs in error and by Mr. John B. Gleason for the defendant in error.

47 W. S. Payne et al.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas ex
rel. S. M. Brewster,
Attorney General.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ray Campbell for the Plaintiffs in error and by Mr. J. L. Hunt for the defendant in error.

50 L. A. Westermann Company,
Petitioner
vs.
The Dispatch Printing
Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles C. Williams for the petitioner and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett and Mr. Luther Day for the respondent

Friday, November 13th, 1908, continued.

56 Mount St. Mary's Cemetery Association, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William C. Mullins.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Moore for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, November 18th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman it is ordered that Bradley L. Wallace, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, it is ordered that J. Walter Cocke, Esquire to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that H.B. Gray, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh M. Caldwell it is ordered that Frank P. Helsell, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh M. Caldwell, it is ordered that G. Wright Arnold, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

260 Albert Palmer et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

The State of Ohio. On consideration of the motion to affirm and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

260 Albert Palmer et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
1 Orig. vs.
The Trustees of the
Cincinnati Southern

Cincinnati, New Orleans
& Texas Pacific Railway
Company. In Equity.

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proofs and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

336 Detroit & Mackinac
Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Fletcher Paper Company.
In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

37

Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Island Mill Lumber Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

38

Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Churchill Lumber Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

339

Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Richardson Lumber Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by the Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

340

Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Michigan Veneer Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

H. C. King, Plaintiff in Error, 0 vs. The Putnam Investment Company.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. R. Lay et al., Plaintiffs in Error 33 vs.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

G. L. Henderson, William
H. Henderson, John Oscar
Henderson, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

11 vs

Helen R. Resser or Helen R.
Henderson, The Corn Belt
Bank and John E. Pillhof,
Executor of the Estate of Ernest
L. Henderson, deceased.

In error to the
Supreme
Court of the
State of
Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the

the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Milwaukee &
St. Paul Railway
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
12. vs.
Mary O'Connor as
Administratrix of the
Estate of Frank J.
O'Connor, deceased.

In error to the
Supreme
Court of the
State of
Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edmund Penfold Harvey,
Le Berkeley Parsons and
Farmers Loan and Trust
Company, Executors of
William Hall Penfold,
deceased and Edmund Penfold

116 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Eugene M. Travis, as
Comptroller of the
State of New York.

In error to the Surrogate's Court, New York County, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Surrogates' Court, New York County, State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Cincinnati Traction Company and The Cincinnati Street Railway Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,
246 vs.
The City of Cincinnati.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged

error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig'l. Ex parte: In the Matter of Robert H. Thorburn, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig'l. Ex parte: In the Matter of Robert H. Thorburn, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein;

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by The Honorable the Judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York before this Court at the City of Washington on Monday, December 9th 1918, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7/13 The Bunnan Construction Company, Petitioner, vs. John L. Newbold. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7/20 Thomas J. Mooney, Petitioner, vs. The People of the State of California. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, November 18th 1918, continued.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday the 25th instant to Monday, December 9th next.

A. Vitelli & Son,
Petitioner
07 vs.
The United States;
and
A. Vitelli & Son,
Petitioner,
08 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, it is ordered that these cases be, and they are hereby, passed.

James A. Peterson
Plaintiff in Error,
67 vs.
The United States;

Jacob Frohwerk,
Plaintiff in Error,
85 vs.
The United States of America;
and
Eugene V. Debs,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

of America. The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd for the United States.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of William F. Hudgings, Petitioner. — Orig'l

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas A. Connolly in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

571 Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Mrs. Lessie Horton, Administratrix of the Estate of A. M. Horton.

On consideration of the application of petitioner for a stay of proceedings and supersedeas of the execution on the judgment of the Superior Court of Union County, North Carolina, entered herein on September 25th 1918

It is now here ordered by the Court that a stay of proceedings and supersedeas in this cause be and the same is hereby awarded pending the hearing and disposition of this [illegible] condition that within ten days therefrom the petitioner shall execute a bond to the respondent herein in the sum of Twenty five thousand dollars ($25,000.00) conditioned according to law and with sureties to be approved by the Clerk of this Court.

It is further ordered by the Court that all proceedings on said execution be, and the same are hereby enjoined.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

598
Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited,
Appellant,
vs.
Clark Montana Realty Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Wallace, Jr. for the appellant.

55
Paul Appenzellar,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Henry C. Conrad, Associate Judge, &c., Thomas Coleman du Pont, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware.

stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, Plaintiff in Error,
229 vs.
Township of Republic.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

G. S. Nicholas & Company et al., Petitioners,
62 vs.
The United Stat

Monday, November 18th 1918, continued.

63 Alexander W. Shaw & Company, et al., and Petitioners vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, it is ordered that these cases be, and they are hereby, passed.

723 William Wrigley, Jr. Company, Petitioner vs. L. P. Larson Jr., Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James R. Offield in behalf of Mr. Robert H. Parkinson, Mr. Isaac H. Mayer, and Mr. Wallace R. Lane for the petitioner and by by Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. Frank F. Reed for the respondent.

56 Mount St. Mary's Cemetery Association, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William C. Mullins.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Moore for the plaintiff in error by Mr. Matthew A. Fyke for the defendant for the plaintiffs in error.

51

Edgar F. Luckenbach
et al.,
(Petitioners)
vs.
W. J. McCahan
Sugar Refining Company et al.,

This cause was argued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the petitioners, by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin for respondent, Insular Line, and by Mr. Lawrence Kneeland for respondent W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining Company.

53

North Pacific Steamship
Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Hall Brothers Marine
Railway & Shipbuilding
Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, November 19th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr. it is ordered that A. Z. Patterson, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, it is ordered that Morris H. Wolf

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Edward R. Johnston, it is ordered that Ernest C. Glenny, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. C. Butte, it is ordered that Albert A. DeJunge, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited,
Appellant,
598 vs.
Clark-Montana Realty Company et al.

The motions to dismiss in this cause were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., in behalf of Mr.

in support of the motion; and by Mr. T. L. Chadbourne, Mr. K. R. Babbitt and Mr. William Wallace, Jr. for the appellant in opposition thereto.

60 Herbert M. Sears,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Inhabitants of the Town of Nahant, etc.;
and
61 Frederick R. Sears et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Inhabitants of the Town of Nahant, etc.

On motion of Mr. B. E. Eames for the plaintiffs in error it is ordered that these causes be, and they are hereby, passed; to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

53 North Pacific Steamship Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Hall Brothers Marine Railway & Shipbuilding Company.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the appellant and case submitted by Mr. Warren Gregory and Mr. Allen L. Chickering for the appellee.

57 Joseph Pinsterwald,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Selma R. Burk.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his writ of error and failing to appear it is thereupon in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court and on the motion of Mr. J. Kent Rawley, of counsel for the defendant in error, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

58 Harvey Walters,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and by Mr. Maurice B. Dean for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

34 Cleve W. Van Dyke et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Arizona Eastern Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Prentiss for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Charles L. Rawlins for the defendant in error.

64 J. Homer Fritch, Incorporated, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen and Mr. Ira A. Campbell for the plaintiffs in error.

47 James G. Petrie et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. B. E. Stoutemeyer for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, November 19th 1918, continued.

65

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. N. H. Loomis for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, November 20th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Doremus, it is ordered that Howard C. Baldwin, Esquire and George E. Brand, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

it is ordered that Perry B. Turpin, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, it is ordered that Alexander S. Drescher, Esquire of Brooklyn, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Leonard K. Guiler, Esquire of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania and Frank Parker Ufford, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson H. Loomis, it is ordered that Maurice H. Winger, Esquire of Kansas City, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, November 20th 1918, continued:

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Collins, it is ordered that John A. Bussian, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King it is ordered that Charles C. Wilson, Esquire, of Nyssa, State of Oregon be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New Orleans, Mobile & Chicago Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error.
vs
71 W. E. McCardle et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore in pursuance of said authority it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

68 Union Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. N. H. Loomis for the plaintiff in error by Mr. A. Z. Patterson for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. N. H. Loomis for the plaintiff in error.

69 Millie W. Burns, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George W. Saul.

This cause was argued by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. A. P. Ufford for the defendant in error.

70 Mrs. Rose Snyder, Plaintiff in Error, vs. King County, Washington, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. G. Wright Arnold for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear counsel for the defendants in error.

16 The United States, Appellant, vs.

E. W. Bliss Company. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal;

Therefore in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

15 E. W. Bliss Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George W. Field for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, November 21st, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. E. S. Bailey, it is ordered that Howard L. Kern, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert D. Stephens, it is ordered that W. Calvin Wells, Esquire, and W. P. Shinault, Esquire, of Oxford, State of Mississippi be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin P. Grosvenor, it is ordered that Gilbert Bettman, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Elmer S. Chace, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Adel O. Harden, of San Diego, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

80 James H. Cochnower, Appellant, vs. — On motions of Mr. G. Carroll Todd for the

ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

77
Willie M. Going Administratrix &c.,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. L. Welborn for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Walter R. Staples, Mr. Theodore W. Reath and Mr. Roy B. Smith, for the defendant in error.

15
E. W. Bliss Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George H. Field for the appellant and concluded by Mr. G. Carroll Todd for the appellee.

72
W. Campbell,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Annie Wadsworth, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick, for the defendants in error and submitted by Mr. C. Wale Wolfe for the plaintiff in error.

73	Robert G. Wick, et al., &c., Petitioners, vs. F. Thomas Parker et al., &c.	This cause was argued by Mr. A. Hurd Anderson for the Petitioners and by Mr. John Weaver for the respondents.
74	Pure Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Minnesota.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Nathan H. Chase for the

plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Egbert S. Oakley for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, November 22d 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal;
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith it is ordered that Roland Ellis, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. Wood, it is ordered that Eli Stansbury, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney

counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Austin it is ordered that A. B. Hunt Esquire, and G. A. Wingfield, Esquire of Roanoke, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, it is ordered that G. E. McCaskill, Esquire of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that Ralph C. Thulin, Esquire, of Ware State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

74 Pure Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs.	The argument of this cause was continued

Carl S. Oakley, for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Nathan H. Chase for the plaintiff in error.

75 Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, et al., vs. The Arctic Iron Company. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. C. Dustin for Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, continued by Mr. S. W. Shaull and Mr. C. C. Daniels for the Arctic Iron Company and concluded by Mr. Horace Andrews for the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company.

76 Union Fish Company, Petitioner, vs. John W. Erickson. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. G. S. Arnold, and Mr. William Denman for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles J. Heggerty for the respondent.

78 William Allen [illegible], Appellant, vs. [illegible]. This cause was argued by Mr. Homer Guerry for the appellant and by Mr.

Herrick for the appellee.

77 Jennie McCarty McMath Administratrix &c.
Appellant.
vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William E. Russell for the appellant and submitted by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, November 25th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by the Honorable Thomas W. Gregory, Attorney General of the United States, it is ordered that Joseph P. Watson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, Joseph P. Mulqueen, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, and Harvey D. Jacob, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counselors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Joseph Millerson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Job Barnard it is ordered that Ralph C. Putnam, Esquires, of Aurora and Thomas F. Donovan of Joliet, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Lamar, it is ordered that Samuel A. Dew, Esquire, of Kansas City State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff it is ordered that Roger W. Cooley, Esquire, of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bradley L. Wallace, it is ordered that Abram Zoller, Esquire, of Little Falls, Morgan B. Gadsby, Esquire, of New Hartford, State of New York, and Howard S. Grey, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adel C. Harden, it is ordered that William M. Morton, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, Charles A. O'Connor, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Illinois, Donald E. Bridgman, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, and George S. Stewart, Esquire, of Gary, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that George F. Beatty, Esquire, of Salina, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Rush Trescott it is ordered that H. Alfred Valentine of Wilkes Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

69 Mills W. Barse,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George W. Saul.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Willie M. Young,
Administrator of
Nathan W. Young,
deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter
— Orig'l. of William F. Hudgings,
Petitioner

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter
— Orig'l of William F. Hudgings,
Petitioner

On consideration of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein, and of the argument of counsel in support of same;

It is now here ordered by this Court that a writ of habeas corpus be issued directed to James M. Power, Marshal

States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York commanding him to have the body of said William D. Haldinger, with the day and cause of his detention, before this Court, on Monday, December 9th, 1918, at 12 o'clock, noon, to do, receive, and submit to all and singular those things which this Court shall consider concerning him in this behalf, and to have then and there the said writ with his doings thereon.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

667 James A. Peterson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States;

685 Jacob Frohwerk,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States;
and

714 Eugene V. Debs,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

723

William Wrigley Jr. Company, Petitioner,
vs.
L. P. Larson, Jr., Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig.

Ex parte: In the Matter of Robert Weiss, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus and to admit petitioner to bail, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Mayo Atkinson for the petitioner, with leave to Mr. Assistant Attorney General Todd to file opposition within one week.

145

Standard Varnish Works,
vs.
Steamship "Bris," Rederiaktiebolaget, claimant.

The motion to advance the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius J. Frank for the Standard Varnish Works.

145

Standard Varnish Works,
vs.
Steamship "Bris," Rederiaktiebolaget, claimant.

The motion for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the whole record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Russell Alden in behalf of Mr. Charles S. Haight for the Steamship "Bris" &c.

58

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

636
John P. Schmitt and
Martin Schmitt, &c.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
John Shadrach, Trustee,
&c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or place on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. A. Valentine and Mr. Edwin B. Morgan for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Rush Prescott for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

699
Jose Lopez Garcia,
Appellant,
vs.
Orval P. Townshend,
commanding officer of
Camp Las Casas.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

545
Chesapeake & Ohio
Railway Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of
America;
and
Chesapeake & Ohio

546 Railway Company, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Paton for the petitioner and by Mr. G. Carroll Todd and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

707 Helen Welch, Petitioner vs. John A. [illegible], Guardian, etc., et al.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. A. B. Quinton, Mr. Eugene S. Quinton and Mr. George W. Rodgers for the petitioner.

Monroe Building Company et al., Petitioners vs. Frank Lawhead, Trustee, etc.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Max Kuhn and Mr. Harrison Lee for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Ward for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday December 9th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Henry Swartz, Esquire, of New York City, Henry Root Harriman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Sam S. Bennett, Esquire, of Albany, Herman N. Swift, Esquire, of Columbus, and A. Pratt Adams, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were [illegible]

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Edwin L. Gluck, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph S. Graydon, it is ordered that Patrick J. Ryan, Esquire of St. Paul, and Clarence P. Diepenbrock, Esquire of Red Wing, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene it is ordered that Charles J. Pretzman, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. S. Bailey, it is ordered that Walter H. Bender, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn

5240

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Edmund Steinhauer it is ordered that Arthur H. Quinntance Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, it is ordered that Homer J. Loomis Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B.F. Macfarland it is ordered that Charles M. Bracelen Esquire of New York City and H.W. Pillsbury Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Delaney it is ordered that Chauncey DeSeur Dennis Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice

Monday, December 9th 1918, continued:

an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clifford Walker, it is ordered that William Butt, Esquire of Blue Ridge, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dutton Boylawki, it is ordered that Lorenz Reich, Jr., Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Carlyle Shelley it is ordered that Robert Craven Shelley, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. G. Hudson, Jr., it is ordered that Richard H. White, Esquire, of Alexandria, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. G. Lee it is ordered that John B. Parker, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. H. Hart, it is ordered that Edward Howard Baker, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. McWhelan it is ordered that James H. Hanley, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. A. Kerr, it is ordered that Raymond K. Dykema, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, and Frank C. McKenney, Esquire, of

be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cecil Barnes, it is ordered that Edmund W. Pugh, Esquire, of Los Angeles, and George J. Hatfield, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered Gabriel C. Duque, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; Joseph Linde, Esquire, of New York City, and George C. Snyder, Esquire, of Delaware, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sydney Anderson, it is ordered that John W. Ogren, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois and Eugene C. Bonn, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court an

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Gustav A. Behrens, Esquire, [illegible] be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lowell, it is ordered that Lawrence G. Brooks, Esquire, of West Medford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

47.

James G. Petrie, Oliver M. Hague, R. F. Blucher, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed

the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

74 Pure Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Minnesota. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Orig. State of Iowa, Complainant, vs. Abraham Slimmer, Jr., et al. On consideration of the motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice

29 Franz Pempel,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed ~~with costs~~; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

41 The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
George B. Spearin;
and

45 George B. Spearin,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeals from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

51 Edgar F. Luckenbach et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining Company, and the Insular Line.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

74 Jennie McCarty McMath, Administratrix of the goods, chattels, and credits, which were of Thomas McMath, deceased,

Appellant,

vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles F. Ruddy,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Herman J. Rossi.

17

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

W. S. Payne, L. H. Powell, et al,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas ex rel. S. M. Brewster, Attorney General.

44

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

113

Frank Nicoulin,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John J. O'Brien.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

27

United Drug Company,
Petitioner and Appellant,
vs.
X Theodore Rectanus Company.

On writ of certiorari to and appeal from the United St

Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

212

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this

States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Division No. 1.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

378 W. C. Sterrett as Receiver of the Alabama Trust & Savings Company, Petitioner vs. Second National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings not inconsistent with the of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Day.

The Buckeye Powder Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Company, Eastern Dynamite Company, and International Smokeless Powder and Chemical Company. — In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

7

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

58

Harvey Walters,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of
Michigan.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

65

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Public Service Commission
of Missouri.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said

Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

310 Gulf Oil Corporation, Petitioner,
vs.
C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty third District of Pennsylvania.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

15 E. W. Bliss Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court; and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

Dissenting: Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

59 Oliver W. Van Dyke, Ida A. Van Dyke, his wife, and Patrick H. McGuire, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Arizona Eastern Railroad Company. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Louis H. Orr, Appellant, vs. Henry M. Allen, Edward A. Deeds, Gordon Rentschler, and The Board of Directors of the Miami Conservancy District.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

288

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

636

John A. Schmitt and
Martin Schmitt, trad-
ing as John A. Schmitt's
Sons,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
John Shadrach, Trustee
in Bankruptcy of
George B.F. Eckert.

In error to the
United States
Circuit Court
of Appeals for
the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

70

Mrs. Rose Snyder,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
King County, Washington,
and the State of Wash-
ington.

In error to
the Supreme
Court of the
State of Wash-
ington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Robert
Orig'l Weiss,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

58 The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Monday, December 9th 1918, continued.

598
Butte & Superior
Copper Company,
Limited,
Appellant,
vs.
Clark-Montana
Realty Company,
and Elm Orlu
Mining Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

598
Butte and Superior
Copper Company,
Limited,
Appellant,
vs.
Clark-Montana
Realty Company,
and Elm Orlu
Mining Company,

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

745
Standard Varnish
Works,
vs.

Monday, December 9th 1918, continued.

Steamship "Bris", Rederiaktiebolaget Claimant. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause; It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted; and the cause assigned for argument after case No. 179.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White)

445 Standard Varnish Works, vs. Steamship "Bris" Rederiaktiebolaget, Claimant. On consideration of the motions for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

99 José López Garcia, Appellant, vs. Orval P. Townshend, Commanding Officer, Camp Las Casas. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

545

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

546

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner.
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by said petition be, and the is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

707 Alden Welch, Petitioner,
vs.
John A. Daniels, Guardian of Maud Welch Stanfield, et al.,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monroe Building Company, Clifton M. Kolb, Harold Hutchins and H. Hutchins & Company, Petitioners,

35 vs.

Frank Lewhead, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Segar Rather Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for

Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd presented Mr. Alexander C. King, of Georgia, as Solicitor General of the United States.

The Chief Justice said:

"Mr. Solicitor General, it gives us pleasure to welcome you in your official capacity to this bar of which you are already a member and to which, indeed, you are by no means a stranger. I am glad moreover to say that in the discharge of our responsibilities we are to have the aid of the enlightened and faithful performance by you of the duties with which you are charged. Let the commission be recorded."

The said commission is in the following words:

Woodrow Wilson,
President of the United States of America,
To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

Know ye; That reposing special Trust and confidence in the Integrity and Ability of Alexander C. King of Georgia, I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Solicitor General and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to Law and to have and to hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments thereunto of right appertaining unto him the said Alexander C. King.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the Letters to be made Patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand,
in the District of Columbia,
the 21st day of November
in the year of our Lord,
one thousand nine hundred
and eighteen and of the
Independence of the United
States of America, the one
hundred and forty-third.
Woodrow Wilson.

Seal

By the President:
T. W. Gregory,
Attorney General.

320 Emanuel Baltzer et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;
and
321 William J. Head,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, restored to the docket.

367 The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
C. T. Doremus;
and
370 W. S. Webb et al.,
vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that these cases be, and they are hereby passed.

763 Frank W. Blair
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The United States of America;

764 Allan A. Templeton,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of

America;

765 Thomas P. Phillips,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America;

766 Frank W. Blair,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States
of America;

67 Allan A. Templeton,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of
America;
and

68 Thomas P. Phillips,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States
of America.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States.

Missouri Pacific Rail-

11 (Plaintiffs in Error,) vs. The State of Kansas.

On motion of Mr. Everett P. Wheeler in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file the brief of Everett P. Wheeler and Elihu Dickerman as amici curiae in this cause.

370 W. S. Webb et al., vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Duane E. Lindquist in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

— Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of Jacob Frohwerk, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Lindquist for the petitioner.

734 J. Tucker Burr, et al., Partners &c., Appellants, vs. The City of Columbus, Ohio, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Joseph S. Clark for the appellants.

Monday, December 9th 1918, continued.

Orig'l

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
vs.
The Tennessee Copper
Company et al.

The joint motion of the State of Georgia and Tennessee Copper Company for leave to file stipulation that the further progress of said cause, so far as relates to the Tennessee Copper Company, be suspended and continued in accordance with the terms of the stipulation was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford Walker for the complainant.

93

H. C. Draper,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Georgia, Florida & Alabama Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. T. S. Hawes for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

30

J. M. Ferguson and J. C. Blanchard,
Appellants,
vs.
Babcock Lumber & Land Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the

[illegible]

Franklin Shields and Mr. A. Holt Johnston for the appellee in support of the motions, and by Mr. Mark W. Brown and Mr. J. A. Smiley for the appellants in opposition thereto.

631/ Ernest E. Richards and Nugent J. Flynn, partners &c. et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Mina M. Oakley.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William S. Hogsett and Mr. Mont. J. Prewitt for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John G. Park for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

517/ J. F. Searle, Minnie A. Gibbs, and Merrill Cox & Company, Petitioners,
vs.
Mechanics Loan & Trust Company and Exchange National Bank of Spokane, Washington, Creditors, &c.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari [illegible] has been filed.

Therefore in pursuance of said motion It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

712 John J. Shea, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. and

713 John J. Shea, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Rufus S. Day in behalf of Mr Edmund H. Moore, Mr Sherman T. McPherson and Mr. Edmund P. Moulinier for the petitioner and by Mr Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

47 Henry C. Hall, administrator, &c., Petitioner vs. William A. Paine et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court ments by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. William L. Glass for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert M. Morse and Mr. William S. Evarts for the respondent.

749

Nels O. Hultberg, Petitioner
vs
Rudeborg A. Anderson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank Van Sant in behalf of Mr. Silas H. Strawn and Mr. Harris F. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Blood Smith, Mr. Axel Chytraus, Mr. John J. Healy & Mr. E. Allen Frost for the respondent.

750

Ex parte: In the Matter of Lloyd H. Duncan, Petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Lloyd H. Duncan for the petitioner pro se.

769

Richland Steamship Company, Petitioner
vs
Buffalo Dry Dock Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, December 9th 1918 continued:

Ended by Mr. Frank S. Bright in behalf of Mr. Harvey D. Goulder and Mr. Thomas H. Garry for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas W. Burke, Mr. Norman A. Kelley and Mr. George D. Cottrell for the respondent.

25 Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of The Whitney Steamboat Corporation, Petitioner. — This cause was argued by Mr. Alexander S. Bacon for the petitioner,

and by Mr. Peter S. Carter for the respondent.

7 Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of William H. Hudgings, Petitioner. — This cause was argued by Mr. Jesse Fuller, Jr. for the petitioner

and by Mr. Solicitor-General King for the respondent.

666. Detroit United Railway, Appellant, vs. City of Detroit. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson for

the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, December 10th 1918

Pursuant to adjournment the Court
today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Ju
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associa
Mahlon Pitney   Justic
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court
opened.

On motion first made to the Cou
in this behalf by Mr. Burgess H. Mar
shall, it is ordered that John R. Stat
Esquire, of San Francisco, State of Cal
fornia be admitted to practice as a
attorney and counsellor of this Court a
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf by James A. Reed, it i
ordered that Frank M. [illegible] Esquire

Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler it is ordered that Clarence Bishop Smith, Esquire, and Robinson Leech, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Mathis, it is ordered that Floyd H. Wingo, Esquire, of Stuttgart, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. H. [illegible] it is ordered that Joseph R. Brocker, Esquire, of Ozark, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey ance of Walter W. H. Hardy, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, and Raymond S. Oakes, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

27 Orig. Ex parte:_In the Matter of William F. Hudgings, (Petitioner.)

On consideration of the motion to admit the petitioner to bail, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the petitioner will be admitted to bail forthwith on giving bond in the sum of One Thousand dollars ($1,000.00), said bond to be approved by a Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

666 Detroit United Railway, Appellant, vs. City of Detroit.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Allan H. Frazer for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Richard I. Lawson for the appellant.

164 The United States of America and Mrs. Josephine Brand,
Appellants,
vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company et al.;

---

165 The United States of America and William P. Burnee,
Appellants,
vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company, et al.; and

166 The United States of America and Stephen McGrant,
Appellants,
vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company, et al.;

Four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases and three counsel allowed to argue orally for the appellees. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the United States, and continued by Mr. Mark Norris, Mr. W. C. Hudson and Mr. H. H. White for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, December 4th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met to day at the Capitol.

(Present:)

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that Robert M. Switzer, Esquire, of Gallipolis, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Walter W. Makepeace, Esquire, of Waterbury, State of Connecticut, Robert Southall Bright, Esquire; Gustavus Stanton Middleton, Esquire, of Philadelphia; Edgar Munson, Esquire, of Williamsport, State of Pennsylvania; ~~Richard H. Wiswall, Esquire, of Salem, State of Massachusetts~~; Edmund Harris Lewis, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York; Junius Grant Adams, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina; John Gilman Dinsmore, Esquire, of Greenville, State of Texas, and John Ambrose Tyson, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of Mississippi, be admitted ractice as attorneys and counsellors of his Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court their behalf by Mr. W. W. Bride, it was [illegible] ordered that Leslie Craven, Esquire, of ellingham, State of Washington, and lfred M. Craven, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted practice as attorneys and counsellors this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court the behalf by Mr. Robert G. Dodge, is ordered that Richard H. Wiswall, Esquire, of Salem, State of Massachusetts and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of
America and Mrs.
Josephine Brown,
Appellants,
164 vs.
New Orleans Pacific
Railway Company
et al.;

The United States of
America and William
R. Turner,
Appellants,
165 vs.
New Orleans Pacific
Railway Company
et al.;
and
The United States of
America and Stephen
W. Grant,
Appellants,
166 vs.
New Orleans Pacific
Railway Company
et al.

The argument of
these cases was
concluded by Mr.
Assistant Attorney
General Kearful

for the Appellants.

347 John E. Roots, Appellant, vs. The United States of America et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. T. Richey for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellees.

398 Rebecca Coon, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Kennedy.

This cause was argued by Mr. James W. Carpenter, Jr., for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Isidor Kalisch for the defendant in error.

08 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Homer Gudger.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Joseph S. Graydon for the defendant in error.

09 The Hebe Company et al., Appellants, vs.

of State &c., et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants and continued by Mr. Lewis W. Johnson for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, December 12th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert it is ordered that L. de Grove Potter, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. McHugh, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Montague, it is ordered that Cadwallader J. Collins, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling it is ordered that W. E. McNeill, Esquire, of Pawnee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. C. Hilliard, it is ordered that Charles H. Haines, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of James Thomson Muir, Master of the British Steam [illegible] Transport "[illegible]" Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of prohibition or writ of mandamus and for leave to counsel for the British Embassy to file brief and make oral argument as amici curiae was submitted to the considera-tion of the Court by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert in behalf of counsel for the petitioner and counsel for the British Embassy.

64 The Hebe Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Norman E. Shaw, Secretary of State, &c., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Louis W. Johnson and Mr. Charles J. Pretzman for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants.

49 Alanwilde Transport Corporation vs. Vacuum Oil Company, and

50 Alanwilde Transport Corporation vs.

These causes were argued by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for Alanwilde Transport Corporation, and by Mr. John C. Prizer for Vacuum Oil Company and A. W. Rid-

Thursday, December 12th 1918, continued.

479	International Paper Company, Petitioner, vs. The Schooner "Gracie D. Chambers" etc.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Robinson Leech for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, December 13th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Szold, it is ordered that Max Michael, Esquire, of Athens, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ( )

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that David Henry

Alabama, be admitted to practic
attorney and counsellor of this Co
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to
Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F.
Ogilby, it is ordered that E. V
Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Ar
be admitted to practice as an
and counsellor of this Court, and he
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. William Grah
it is ordered that Charles Dudley
shall, Esquire, of Rock Island, St
Illinois be admitted to practice
an attorney and counsellor of this
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. C
ler, it is ordered that James Ben
McLaughlin, Jr., Esquire, of New Yo
City, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this Court
he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Pacific Com-
pany,
Plaintiff in Error,

s ordered
nell, and

the
R.
Hayes,
izona,
attorney
was

Court
hams,
Mar-
ale) of
as
Board.

Court
Chand
mith
rk
son
and

---

89 Frank R. Stewart

On motion of Mr. Ed. R. Ogilby, it is ordered that this cause be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

84 William J. Hegarty, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company.

It is ordered that this case be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

474 International Paper Company, Petitioner
vs.
The Schooner Gracie D. Chambers etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Robinson Leech for the respondent.

713 Standard Varnish Works
vs.
Steamship "Bris" Aktieselskabet [illegible] Claimant.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Julius ~~H~~ J. Frank and continued by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, for the Standard Varnish Works; by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for Steamship Bris for Standard Varnish Works.

375 Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant, vs. E. B. Howard, State auditor, &c., et al.

This cause
argued b
Malcolm
Rosser fo
appellan
by Mr. S

Printing for the appellees.

13 W. W. Fink et al., Trustees, &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County, Oklahoma, et al.

The argu
of this ca
was comm
by Mr. C
B. Roger
the plain
in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is
adjourned until Monday next at twelve
o'clock.

Monday, December 16th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

(Present:)

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal;
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Douglas, it is ordered that Louis Irving Reichner, Esquire; Lewis Harlow Van Dusen, Esquire; and Horace Stern, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

it is ordered that Harold L. Bode
Esquire, of Buffalo, James Laurie Ma
colm, Esquire, of Catskill, and R. S
McQuiston, Esquire, of New York City
of New York, be admitted to practice
attorneys and counsellors of this C
and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. L. Meriwether S
it is ordered that George Cameron B
Esquire, of New York City; Charles A
Dunham, Esquire, of Boston, State
Massachusetts; and George Ernest
Ballhorn, Esquire, of Milwaukee, S
of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice
attorneys and counsellors of this C
and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
by Mr. Robert Redfield it is ordered
Roscoe Stewart, Esquire of Springfield
State of Missouri and John H. Ray,
Esquire, of Minneapolis State of Min
sota, be admitted to practice as atto
and counsellors of this Court, and they
were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Ramsey Hoy
is ordered that Ross B. Collins E

of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Bell, it is ordered that H. B. Manard, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, it is ordered that Charles M. McWilliams, Esquire, and Maurice Hirsch, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Wilson, it is ordered that Harold O. Mulks, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Paul R. Cra
it is ordered that John William He
Esquire, of Santa Barbara, and He
Eglston Texan, Esquire, of Los Angele
State of California, be admitted t
tice as attorneys and counsellors of
Court, and they were sworn accordi

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston,
ordered that Harry A. Hickard, Esq
of Los Angeles State of California
admitted to practice as an attorne
counsellor of this Court, and he wa
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry
Rainey, it is ordered that William
Colby Esquire, of East St. Louis, S
of Illinois, be admitted to practic
an attorney and counsellor of this C
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. George Francis
Williams it is ordered that James
White, of Chicago, State of Illinois
admitted to practice as an attorney an
counsellor of this Court, and he

sworn according ly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. R. Campbell, it is ordered that James J. Costello, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and was sworn according ly.

72 W. Campbell,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Annie Wadsworth,
Maggie Seamore and
Nancy Alexander.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court

40

Wells Fargo & Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Nevada.

In error t
Supreme
Court of
State of N

This cause came on to be heard on
transcript of the record from the Supre
Court of the State of Nevada, and wa
argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is n
here ordered and adjudged by this Co
that the judgment of the said Supre
Court in this cause, be, and the sam
is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice VanDevanter.

347

John E. Reade,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of
America and Joseph
P. Dillon, U.S. Mar
shal for the District
of Arizona.

Appeal from th
District Court of
the United Stat
for the Distric
of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on
the transcript of record from the District
Court of the United States for the Distric
of Arizona and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now
now ordered adjudged and decreed by the

Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

H. C. Draper,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Georgia, Florida & Alabama Railway Company.

493

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. M. Ferguson and
J. C. Blanchard,
Appellants,
vs.
The Babcock Lumber & Land Company.

630

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be hea
the transcript of the record from th
United States Circuit Court of Ap
for the Fourth Circuit and on mo
to dismiss or affirm which was a
by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is n
here ordered, adjudged, and decreed
this Court that this appeal be, and
same is hereby dismissed for the wa
of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

–Orig'l Ex parte: In the Matter of James Thomson Muir Master of the British Admiralty Transport "Gleneden." Petitioner	On consideratio of the motion leave to file petition for a writ of prohibiti or a writ of ma damus herein

It is now here ordered by the Court that
said motion be, and the same is hereby
granted.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

–Orig'l Ex parte. In the Matter of James Thompson Muir Master of the British Admiralty Transport "Gleneden." Petitioner	On considerati of the petition a writ of prohi bition or a wri of mandamus herein

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York and Honorable Thomas I. Chatfield, a Judge thereof, before this Court, at the City of Washington on Monday, January 6th, 1919, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter of James Thomson Muir, Master of the British Admiralty Transport "Glenedon",
Petitioner.
Orig'l.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief herein, in behalf of the British Embassy, and to take part in the oral argument,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter of Jacob Workwerk,
Petitioner,
Orig'l.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

754 J. Tucker Burr et al., partners doing business under the firm name and style of Parkinson & Burr, Appellants, vs. The City of Columbus, Ohio, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 715. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

763 Frank W. Blair, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America;

764 Allan A. Templeton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America;

Thomas P. Phillips, Plaintiff in Error

765
vs
The United States;

Frank H. Blair,
Appellant,
766
vs.
The United States of
America;

Allan A. Templeton,
Appellant,
767
vs.
The United States of
America; and

Thomas P. Phillips,
Appellant,
768
vs.
The United States of
America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases; It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

John J. Shea,
Petitioner
12
vs
The United States

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of

Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

743

John J. Shea, Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry C. Hall, Administrator of the Estate of James M. Hall, Petitioner

747 vs.
William A. Brown et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

49 Nels O. Hultberg, Petitioner,
vs.
Rudebourg A. Anderson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

750 Ex parte: In the Matter of Lloyd H. Duncan, Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

769 Richland Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Buffalo Dry Dock Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had of or against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 23d instant, to Monday, January 6th next.

211 The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General King, Mr. G. Carroll Todd, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George Hoadley, Mr. Judson Harmon, Mr. Edward Colston, Mr. A. W. Goldsmith, and Mr. Oscar Stoehr for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Emanual Buttzer, Gottfried Baltzer, Ulrich Lenischmidt
et al.,

320

vs.
The United States of
America.

In error t
District C
of the Un
States fo

District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be h
on the transcript of the record from
District Court of the United States
the District of South Dakota and
Solicitor General King, of counsel
defendant in error having filed a
fession of error and moved the
to reverse the judgment herein,

It is therefore in pursuance
said confession and motion, now
ordered and adjudged by this Co
that the judgment of the said Di
Court in this cause be, and the sa
is hereby reversed; and that the
be, and the same is hereby rema
to the said District Court for furth
proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Wh

321

William J. Head,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America.

In error t
District C
of the Uni
States fo
District of
South Dak

This cause came on to be heard

the transcript of record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and Mr. Solicitor General King of counsel for the defendant in error having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein;

It is therefore in pursuance of said confession and motion now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

567 James A. Peterson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to reassign this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error. The Solicitor General answering.

685 Jacob Frohwerk,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.

of America;
and
Eugene V. Debs,
Plaintiff in Error,
714 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

Wirt K. Winton, Administrator etc., et al.,
Appellants,
123 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

—

J. S. Bounds, Attorney in Fact for J. A. Bounds
Appellant,
124 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

—

John London
Appellant
vs.
125 Jack Amos and others known as the

The motion to remand these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by William H. Scott for the appellants in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson in opposition thereto.

Mississippi Choctaws;

Walter S. Field et al.,
Appellants,
126 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. J. Beckham,
Appellant,
127 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

William N. Vernon,
Appellant,
128 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

and

Kate A. Howe, Executrix, etc.,
Appellants,
129 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws.

The motion to remand these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson for the appellee in opposition thereto.

576

Georgia State Board of
Examiners of Optometry
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Kennon Mott.

The m
to a
in th
cause
subm
to th
submitt

the Court on the record and printed argu
ments by Mr. Owens Johnson for the
fendant in error in support of the m
and by Mr. James K. Hines for the
plaintiffs in error in opposition there

7 Origl.

State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
vs.
State of Mississippi;
and

171

Rust Land & Lumber
Company,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Ed. Jackson et al.

The motio
to set th
cause f
hearing
the same
time, wa
submitted
the conside
tion of th
Court by
James Jac

Instate in behalf of counsel.

19 Origl.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The motion
leave to fi
ion and
[illegible]
[illegible]

and for a division of expense of printing the record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Ryan in behalf of counsel for the complainant, and by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. John E. Palmer for the defendant.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
525 vs
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. T. S. Butler in behalf of Mr. Henry C. Peeples and Mr. Claude Waller for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Rush Taggart and Mr. William L. Clay for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Ex Parte: In the Matter
Orig'l of Sami Sylvester,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of habeas corpus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold D. Mulks for the petitioner.

W. H. Rousmey,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
M. L. Patterson.

58

In error
Supreme
of the S
Oklah

This cause having been calle
hearing in its regular order, and
pearing to the Court that the parti
failed to print the transcript
record.

It is therefore in pursuanc
tenth rule of this Court, now here
and adjudged by this Court tha
writ of error in this cause be, and
same is hereby dismissed with co
Per Mr. Chief Justice

Oklahoma City Mill
& Elevator Company,
Petition
vs.
Pampa Grain Company.

522.

The peti
for a w
of certi
herein
submitte
to the c
-ideration of the Court by Mr. Josep
Bailey for the petitioner.

Henry A. Wise, Trustee
et al.
Petitioners
vs.
The Commonwealth of

537

Virginia et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera tion of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry A. Wise for the petitioners and by Mr. J. D. Hank, Jr., for the respondent.

Sam Orr Dibble,
Petitioner,
763 vs.
Southern Express Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Ernest F. Cochran for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the respondent.

W. H. Fink et al. Trustees &c.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
43 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County, Oklahoma et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles B. Rodgers for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles B. Rogers for the plaintiffs in error.

James N. Cochran;

80 vs
The United States.

This cause
argued by
William E
for the appellant and submit
Mr. Assistant Attorney General,
and Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for th
appellee.

Herbert M. Sears,
Plaintiff in Error,
60 vs.
Inhabitants of the
Town of Nahant, &c.
and
Frederick R. Sears et
al.,
Plaintiffs in Error.
61 vs.
Inhabitants of the Town
of Nahant.

These
were
by M
ter E
for th
tiffs in
and b
Robert
Wedge
the def
ants a

Ruth A. Milner,
Executrix of the Estate
of Stanley B. Milner,
deceased, et al.
Appellants
81 vs
The United States

Appeal
the Unite
States Cir
Court of
peals fro
Eighth, Ci
cuit.

This cause came on to be hear
the transcript of the record from

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and the appellants having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute their appeal, and failing to appear;

It is thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court and on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful of counsel for the appellee now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

82.
Maude L. Andrews,
Administratrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Virginian Railway
Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. P. Staples for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, December 17th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. McHugh it is ordered that David E. McLaughlin, Esquire, of Plentywood, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. S. Bailey, it is ordered that John Vernon Boshmer Jr., Esquire, [illegible] be admitted to practice as an

attorney and counsellor of this Court, and
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
n this behalf by Mr. Harvey M. Friend,
t is ordered that John A. Hellenthal, Es-
quire of Juneau, Territory of Alaska, and
Bernard H. Gessell, Esquire, of Montgomery,
State of Alabama, be admitted to prac-
tice as attorneys and counsellors of this
Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
n this behalf by Mr. H. H. Scott it is
rdered that Maurice B. Fluck, Esquire,
f New York City be admitted to prac-
tice as an attorney and counsellor of this
ourt, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
this behalf by Mr. H. L. Bodamer it
ordered that George John Ritchie, Es-
quire, of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsyl-
nia be admitted to practice as an
torney and counsellor of this Court and
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher,
is ordered that William L. Hill, Es-

Peterson, Esquire, of Lakeland, Sta
Florida, be admitted to practice
attorneys and counsellors of this
and they were sworn according

On motion first made to th
in this behalf by Mr. W. F. Kirby
ordered that William Morton Ca
quire of Malvern, State of Arkansa
admitted to practice as an attor
counsellor of this Court and he w
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Solom
it is ordered that H. Ralph Cover, Esq
of Westminster, State of Maryland
admitted to practice as an attorney
counsellor of this Court and he wa
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Tow
it is ordered that Eugene Amos Wa
Esquire of Detroit, State of Michig
be admitted to practice as an att
and counsellor of this Court and
was sworn accordingly.

The Yazoo & Mississippi
Valley Railroad Company
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
91. vs.
W. A. McNeill as Adminis-
trator of W. G. McNeill, deceased.

In error to
the Supreme
Court of the
State of
California.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said authority, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Arkadelphia Milling
Company,
Appellant,
92 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company et al.

This cause was
submitted to
the consideration
of the Court on
the record and
printed argu-
ments by Mr.
W. E. Hemingway, Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. D. H.
Cantrell and Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the
appellants and by Mr. J. M. Moore and Mr.
George A. McConnell for the appellees.

93 Joseph F. Naily et ux, &c.,
Appellants,
vs.
St Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. E. Hemingway, Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. D. H. Cantrell, and Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the appellants and by Mr. J. M. Moore and Mr. George A. McConnell for the appellee.

94 St Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, et al,
Appellants,
vs.
The Southern Cotton Oil Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. J. M. Moore, and Mr. George A. McConnell for the appellants and by Mr. W. E. Hemingway, Mr. G. B. Rose Mr. D. H. Cantrell and Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the appellee.

St Louis, South-western Railway Company et al.,
Appellants

95 The Southern Cotton Oil Company. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. M. Moore, and Mr. George A. McConnell for the appellants, and by Mr. W. E. Hemingway, Mr. G. B. Rose and Mr. D. H. Cantrell, and Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the appellee.

97
1
F. A. Hooper, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. S. Kingsbury, as Surveyor General, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Robert T. Devlin, and Mr. Charles C. Boynton for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

98
Frank H. Ayers et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. S. Kingsbury as Surveyor General, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Robert T. Devlin and Mr. Charles C. Boynton for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, December 17th 1918, continued.

82 Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Virginian Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harvey J. Hall and Mr G. A. Wingfield for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. A. B. Hunt for the plaintiff in error.

83. George J. Weigle, Appellant, vs. Curtice Brothers Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter H. Bender for the appellant and by Mr. H. C. Fairchild for the appellee.

85 Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Maucher.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William R. McHugh for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday December 18th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Cox, it is ordered that Robert M. Calfee, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, John M. Maguire Esquire of Cambridge and A. Morris-Crosby Esquire, of Newton, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court
in this behalf

ordered that Charles Julian Bloch
quire of Macon, State of Georgia,
admitted to practice as an attorney
counsellor of this Court, and he w
sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the
in this behalf by Mr. N.T. Fisher it
ordered that Hulette Fuqua Aby, Esq
of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, and
R. Bussey, Esquire, of Forrest City, S
of Arkansas, be admitted to practic
attorneys and counsellors of this Cour
they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Williams M.
lan it is ordered that Frank A.
ne, Esquire of Warrenville, State of
braska, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this Court
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the C
in this behalf by Mr. Richard Downe
it is ordered that Joseph N. Sans, Esq
of New York City, be admitted to practi
as an attorney and counsellor of this C
and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Cour

in this behalf by Mr. Charles Poe, it is ordered that Dale B. Loomis, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, and Robert Guy Smith, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Porter J. McCumber, it is ordered that Charles A. Pollock, Esquire, of Fargo, State of North Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Antonio M. Opisso, it is ordered that John C. MacMahon, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

99

Edward N. Chavelle, as Trustee, &c., Appellant,
vs.
Washington Trust Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr

for the appellant and by Mr. Jam
Murphy for the appellee.

Andy Sumciary et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Sidney P. Mallory et al.

100

This cau
submitted
considerat
the Court
second and

arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney
Kearful, Mr. Joseph C. Stone and
J. H. Lingley for the appellants, a
Mr. J. H. Lewley for the appelle

Bernard Plexner,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John Russon Jr., et al.,
&c.

101

This cau
submitted
considerati
the Court
second and
arguments

Mr. J. S. Laurent for the plaintiff
error and by Mr. Harry P. Weber a
Mr. George H. Miller for the defendan
error.

Charles Middleton
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Texas Power & Light
Company.

102

This cause
submitted
consideration
The Court on
second and
arguments

Mr. Charles B. Braun for the plai

in error and by Mr. Harry P. Lawther and Mr. Alexander Pope for the defendant in error.

04 Candelaria Cordova,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Walter B. Grant, sole executor, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. G. Morris for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Walter B. Grant and Mr. A. J. Beall for the defendant in error.

05 J. M. Selser
Plaintiff in error
vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. H. Wilkinson, Mr. A. L. Alexander, and Mr. A. Alexander for the plaintiff in error. No brief filed for the defendant in error.

85 Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company
Plaintiff in Error
vs.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Philip for the defendant in error.

87 Union Dry Goods Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Georgia Public Service Corporation.

This cause was argued by Mr. Roland Ellis for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. R. Douglas Feagin and Mr. Rudolph S. Wimberly for the plaintiff in error.

90 Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John Zealy et al., partners, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the defendants in error and submitted by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson for the plaintiff in error.

96 A. S. Cohn,
Petitioner
vs.
R. A. Malone, Trustee of A. S. Cohn, bankrupt.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sam S. Bennet for the respondent and submitted by Mr. J. R. Pottle for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, December 19th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. Scofield, it is ordered that Albert C. Smyth, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey M. Friend, it is ordered that Max Lippman, Esquire, as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, it is ordered that William E. Lee, Esquire of Moscow, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

106 The City of Englewood,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Denver & South Platte Railway Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. L. F. Twitchell for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Fred Farrar for the defendant in error.

108 Magnolia Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Board of Supervisors of Pike County, Mississippi.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Edward Mayes for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. R. H. Thompson and Mr. Ross A. Collins for the defendant in error.

111

Chicago Great Western
Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
L. A. Basham, Administrator, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George H. Carr, Mr. Fred P. Carr and Mr. O. M. Brockett for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Thomas A. Cheshire and Mr. Howard J. Clark, for the defendant in error.

114

Philip La Tourette,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Fitz Hugh McMaster as
Insurance Commissioner, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. John L. McLaurin and Mr. Wendell P. Barker for the plaintiff in error, with leave to counsel for the defendant in error to file brief within one week.

115

The Bank of California,
National Association,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
E. D. Roberts, as Treasurer
of the State of California.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record in this case and on the brief submitted in case No. 262.

107

Mary Cavanaugh et al., Appellants,
vs.
Benj. F. Looney etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick for the Appellants, and submitted by Mr. B. F. Looney and Mr. C. M. Cureton for the appellees.

109

Illinois Central Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
L. A. Anderson.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher for the plaintiffs in error and submitted by Mr. Julian C. Wilson and Mr. Walter P. Armstrong for the defendant in error.

112

Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
Walter G. Hamilton, County Treasurer &c., as Public Administrator &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Cannon for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Herbert C. Smyth for the defendant in error.

Merchants Exchange

116	Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Missouri at the relation of John T. Barker, Attorney General. in error.	This cause was argued by Mr. Percy Werner for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John T. Gose for the defendant
117.	Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Territory of Alaska.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. A. Hellenthal for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, December 20th 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Wm R. Day
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Mahlon Pitney Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Scott it is ordered that Carl Frederick Cook, Esquire of Seattle State of Washington and Arthur J. Abbott, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan it

New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Williamson, it is ordered that Frank S. Appleman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, it is ordered that Charles A. Strong, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, it is ordered that Dana B. Hellings, Esquire, of Buffalo, and Warren C. Payne, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clifford Moore, Esquire, of Seward, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

121

George S. Dullinwider,
Appellant,
vs.
The Southern Pacific
Railroad Company
of California et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Fred Beall for the appellant and by Mr. Charles R. Lewers and Mr. William F. Herrin, for the appellees.

59

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Frank R. Stewart.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henley C. Booth, Mr. William R. Harr, Mr. Charles H. Bates, Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby and Mr. William F. Herrin, for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. C. N. Hayes for the defendant in error.

117

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. A. Hellenthal for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. George B. Grigsby for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. J. A. Hellenthal for the plaintiff in error.

118

Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. A. Hellenthal for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. George B. Grigsby for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, December 23d 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. F. Kirby, it is ordered that George B. Martin, Esquire, of Catlettsburg, State of Kentucky, and Joseph E. Evans, Esquire, of Ogden, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that Clarence M. Booth, Esquire, of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Meriwether Smith, it is ordered that Charles M. Harris, Esquire of Versailles, Camden R. McAtee, Esquire of Louisville, State of Kentucky, and W. E. Utterback, Esquire, of Durant, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. L. McKenney, it is ordered that Charles A. Hill, Esquire of Fresno, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

221

International News Service,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Associated Press.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis
Concurring in part: Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

361 John Dillon,
vs.
Strathearn Steamship Company, Claimant of Steamship "Strathearn,"

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said certificate

Per Mr. Justice Day.

392 Erik Sandberg, Carl Janssen, K. Benjaminsen and John Toranen, Petitioners,
vs.
John McDonald, Claimant of the British Ship "Talus."

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United for the Southern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Brandeis

Monday, December 23d 1918. continued.

Carl Neilsen et al.,
Petitioners
393
vs.
Rhine Shipping Company, Claimant of the Sailing Ship "Rhine".

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Day,

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

John Hardy et al.,
Petitioners
394
vs.
Shepherd & Morse Lumber

The Barkentine "Windrush"

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now now ordered and adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company and William G. Mather

75 vs.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

211

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.	In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Georgia State Board
of Examiners in Opto-
metry, C. C. Folsom et
al.,
(Plaintiffs in Error,
576 vs.
Kennon Mott.)

In error to the
Supreme
Court of the
State of
Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ernest E. Richards and
Nugent J. Flynn,
Partners, doing busi-
ness as Richards &
Flynn & Richflynn Amuse-
ment & Beauty Company,
(Plaintiffs in Error,
634 vs
Mina M. Oakley.)

In error to
the Supreme
Court of the
State of
Missouri.

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

525

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

60 Herbert M. Sears,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Inhabitants of the Town of Nahant in the County of Essex and Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

61 Frederick R. Sears,
Herbert M. Sears,
Philip S. Sears and
Richard D. Sears,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Inhabitants of the Town of Nahant in the County of Essex and Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts; and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Orig'l Ex parte: In the Matter of Sam Sylvester,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

667. James A. Peterson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

685 Jacob Frohwerk,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States

Monday, December 23d 1918, continued.

America;
and
Eugene V. Debs,
Plaintiff in Error,
714
vs.
The United States of
America.

On consideration of the motion to reassign these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted; and the case reassigned for argument on Monday January 27th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant.
Orig.
vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion to set this case for argument, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the case assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Rush Land and
Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
71
vs.
Ed. Jackson et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the case be assigned for argument immediately after No. 7.

17 Orig.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant
vs
The State of Minnesota.

It is ordered that the motion for leave to file, open and publish the testimony taken herein, be and the same is hereby granted. It is further ordered that the motion for an order dividing the expense of printing the record herein be, and the same is hereby denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

522

Oklahoma City Mill & Elevator Company,
Petitioner
vs
Pampa Grain Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of {On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the} the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

537

Henry A. Wise, Trustee
and James A. Ballentine
Petitioners
vs

Monday, December 23d 1918, continued.

The Commonwealth of Virginia et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

153 Sam Orr Dibble, Petitioner, vs. Southern Express Company. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Wat H. Winton Administrator &c., et al,
Appellants;
123 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. S. Bounds Attorney
in fact for J. A.
Bounds,
Appellant
124 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

John London,
Appellant,
125 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

Walter S. Field et al,
Appellants,
126 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws;

Monday, December 23rd 1918, continued:

127 J. J. Beckham,
Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

128 William N. Vernon,
Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;
and

129 Katie A. Howe Executrix &c,
Appellant,
vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to remand these cases for additional findings be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cases on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

548 Conrad Kornmann,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of

In error to the District Court of the United States for the We

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and Mr. Solicitor General King, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

417.
D. E. McKinley,
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

591.
The United States of America,
Petitioner,
vs.

Monday, December 23rd 1918, continued.

Suda Reynolds. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Solicitor General King for the petitioner.

233 Thomas H. Robinson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Wesley Steele et al.

The motion to advance and place this cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Carter Pope for the plaintiff in error.

130 Postal Telegraph Cable Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Tonopah & Tidewater Railroad Company;

217 The Western Union Telegraph Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company; and
Postal Telegraph Cable Company.

On motion of Mr Charles W. Needham in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief as amicus curiae in these causes.

404 vs.
Chicago Great Western
Railroad Company.

Minerals Separation,
Ltd., et al.,
Petitioners
599 vs.
Butte & Superior Mining Company.

The application for an order to restrain the respondent from disposing of its assets pending action on the mandate of this Court was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Henry D. Williams, Mr. William Houston Kenyon, Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Garret W. McEnerney and Mr. Odell W. McConnell, for the petitioners in support of the application, and by Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. Frederick, P. Fish, Mr. J. Edgar Bull, Mr. Thomas L. Chadbourne and Mr. Kurnal R. Babbitt for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Minerals Separation
Ltd., et al.,
Petitioners
599 vs.
Butte & Superior Mining
Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the

10, Orig. The State of South Dakota, Complainant, vs. Charles B. Collins.

The motion to set this cause for hearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the complainant.

-Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of Daniel O'Connell et al., Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph L. Pepper for the petitioners.

781 Bosch Magneto Company, Petitioner, vs. Samuel W. Rushmore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Abram J. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Dean and Mr. Irving M. Obrieght for the respondent.

233 Thomas H. Robinson, Plaintiff in Error, vs.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. William R. Hall for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Julian C. Harvey, and Mr. R. Carter Pope for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

350

American Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Paul Lukila and Sam Lukila.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Benjamin F. Ohnick for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Alpheus Byers for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

752

Joseph P. O'Toole et al.,
Petitioners.
vs.
Robert L. Meysenburg et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Marion C. Early for the petitioners.

762

Charles Raison et al.,
Petitioners
vs.

Daniel Adair et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Samuel A. L. Watkins and Mr. James E. White for the petitioners and by Mr. William A. Norell for the respondent.

771 James S. Yeates, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Randolph Cooper for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

772 Charles P. Williams, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Randolph Cooper, for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Monday December 23d 1918, continued.

773 Pontiac Oxford & Northern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners vs. Michigan Railroad Commission et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harrison Geer for the petitioners and by Mr. Alexander J. Groesbeck for the respondents.

780 Michael Peyser, Petitioner vs. Elizabeth J. Grauten.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Maurice B. Fluck for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 6th, 1919 at twelve o'clock.

Monday, January 6th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice:

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices:
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Mr. Attorney General Gregory addressed the Court as follows:

"May it please the Court:

It is with pain and sadness that I announce the death of Colonel Roosevelt, twenty sixth President of the United States. He held that high office from the year 1901 to 1909.

Colonel Roosevelt passed away at Oyster Bay, Long Island, at a quarter past four o'clock this morning. The end physician, his family and a few personal friends. He died in his sixty first year.

I move that the Court adjourn as a mark of respect to the memory of this distinguished statesman, soldier and citizen."

The Chief Justice responded:

"Mr. Attorney General:

The Court sorrows to learn of the death of the great and conspicuous public servant whose services the Country has had and it is consoling to be able to give that mark of respect and veneration to his memory which is suggested by your motion and the Court will transact no business today, but stand adjourned until tomorrow."

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 7th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Gray, it is ordered that John J. Templeman, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, and Alfred M. Cordell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

is ordered that Arthur J. Johnson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that Albert Edward Carter, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ode L. Rankin, it is ordered that Jacob E. Witten, Esquire, and Léon Alexander Berezniak, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Hamel, it is ordered that Thomas M. Gilliard, Esquire, [illegible] be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

in this behalf by Mr. John Ford O'Brien, it is ordered that George A. Van Dusen, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Grandin Grossman, it is ordered that Arthur J. Zeiger, Esquire of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Gower, it is ordered that Harry M. Lewy, Esquire, of New York City and Charles E. Roach, Esquire, of Friendship Heights, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, it is ordered that Henry W. Esser, Jr., Esquire, of Kansas City State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. R. Ogilby, it is ordered that Charles E. Cochran, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Williams, it is ordered that Newman Thomas Egleson, Esquire and Delos Burke Denning, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. Joseph S. Clark, it is ordered that Henley J. Booth, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. G. Davies, it is ordered that J. B. Eldridge, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. B. Craighill, it is ordered that H. C. Routzahn, Jr., Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Barbour, it is ordered that V. R. Shackelford, Esquire of Orange, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Erie Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

112 vs.

Walter G. Hamilton, County Treasurer of the County of Rockland, as Public Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and credits of Stephen Mutechock, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

87

Union Dry Goods Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Georgia Public Service Corporation.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

33

Clarence W. Turner, Appellant, vs. The United States ex rel. the Creek Nation of Indians.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
85 vs.
Joseph Maucher.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John Sealy, Sealy Hutchings, George Sealy, Jr., and H. O. Stein, partners as Hutchings, Sealy and Company.

90

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Merchants Exchange of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Missouri at the relation of John T. Barker, Attorney General.

116

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on

preme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

3

Dennis J. Leary, Appellant,
vs.
The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Jersey City and the City Collector of the City of Jersey City.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the

Jersey.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

218

Guerini Stone Company, Petitioner, vs. P. J. Carlin Construction Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of Porto Rico; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

235 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs Edward M. Comyns and Charles L. Bryson.	In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

78 William Allen Rike, Appellant, vs. Newton Rule	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

now ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Abe Dansiger et al., doing business as Dansiger Brothers, Plaintiffs in Error,
37. vs.
W. E. Cooley.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Union Fish Company, Petitioner,
76 vs.
John W. Erickson.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

George J. Weigle, Appellant,
33 vs.
Curtice Brothers Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western

counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bernard Flexner,
Plaintiff in Error,
101 vs.
John Farson, Jr., William Farson and John A. McElroy doing business as partners under the name and style of Farson, Son & Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

66 The City of Englewood, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Denver & South Platte Railway Company. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

64 The Hebe Company and Carnation Milk Products Company, Appellants, vs. Norman E. Shaw, Secretary of Agriculture of Ohio, and Thomas C. Guthrie, Chief of Bureau of Dairy and Foods of the Board of Agriculture of Ohio. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Parson Son & Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Joe S. Bird as County Treasurer of Shelby County, Alabama.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

5-1

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the

the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

82

Maud F. Andrews, Administratrix of A. H. Andrews, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Virginian Railway Company.

In error to the Roanoke County Circuit Court, State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Roanoke County Circuit Court, State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

111

The Missouri Pacific Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Su-

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

97

F. A. Hooper, Myron T. Dusenbury, C. C. Hartle, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. S. Kingsbury, as Surveyor General and ex officio Register of the State Land Office of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal First Appellate District of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank N. Ayres, Norman

98

Anderson et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. S. Kingsbury as Surveyor General and ex officio Register of the State Land Office of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal First Appellate District of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal First Appellate District of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

99

Edward H. Chandler as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Washington Tent & Boat Company, Bankrupt,
Appellant,
vs.
Washington Trust Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Andy Sunday, David Sunday, Nicholas Sunday et al., Appellants, vs. Sidney P. Mallory, Ed. J. Brennan, Joseph N. Brennan et al.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

100

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, by Anny Sunday as to which said decree be, and the same is hereby affirmed ~~with costs~~; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

05 J. W. Selser, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

08 Magnolia Bank, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Supervisors of Pike County. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad Company and James Stone and W. E. Stone Sureties; Plaintiffs in Error, vs. L. A. Anderson.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

109

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

109 Illinois Central Railroad Company, and James Stone and W. E. Stone, Sureties,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
L. A. Anderson.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Chief Justice White.

233 Thomas M. Robinson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Wesley Steele and John C. Kennedy.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

350 American Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Paul Lukita and Saml Lukita.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on motion to dismiss ~~or affirm~~ which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

—Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of Daniel O'Connell, Thomas Carey, Carl J. D. Wacker, E. R. Hoffman, David Smith and Herman Smith,
Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,
10 Orig'l vs
Charles B. Collins.

On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the hearing of this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case assigned for Monday, March 3d next after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

W. E. McKinley et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
417 vs
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the case assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
591 vs
Sida Reynolds.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

599 Minerals Separation Limited, Minerals Separation (American Syndicate) Limited and Minerals Separation North American Corporation, Petitioners,
vs.
Butte & Superior Mining Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

599 Minerals Separation Limited, Minerals Separation (American Syndicate) Limited, and Minerals Separation North American Corporation Petitioners
vs.

On consideration of the motion for a restraining order herein: It

Tuesday, January 7th 1919, continued:

ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Joseph P. Cooke, et al., Petitioners vs. Robert L. Meysenburg et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

752

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Charles Pairon, J. S. Spalding, Jim Boyd, et al. Petitioners vs. Forrest Adair, Edward M. Hafer, David E. Ashby, et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

762

On consideration of the petition for a

Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Justice White.

771 James S. Yeates, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

772 Charles T. Williams, Petitioner, vs. The United States

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

773 Pontiac, Oxford & Northern Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, v. The Michigan Railroad Commission et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bucks Magnetic Company,
Petitioner

5291

Samuel W. Rushmore. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Harvey C. Shauver.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

4

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tuesday, January 7th 1919, continued.

J. S. Bounds, Attorney
in fact for W. A. Robinson,
Appellant,
24
vs.
Jack Amos and others,
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws;

John London et al.,
Appellants,
25
vs.
Jack Amos and others,
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws;

Walter S. Field et al.,
Appellants,
26
vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws;

J. J. Beckham,
Appellant,
27
vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws;

William N. Moore

128 vs. Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws; and Katie A. Ware Executrix &c. Appellant, 129 vs. Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws. — The motion to dismiss or affirm in these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in opposition.

168 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Purcell Envelope Company. — The motion for an order on the Court of Claims to make and certify findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant in support of the motion, with leave to Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the appellee to file brief on or before Friday next.

The United States of America,

Tuesday, January 7th 1919, continued.

583 vs. The Southern Pacific Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant.

Matthew T. Chapman et al., Petitioners, 586 vs. John A. Wentworth.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King on behalf of counsel for the petitioners. Leave granted the United States to file a memorandum herein on motion of Mr. Solicitor General King in that behalf.

The State of Georgia, Complainant, 1 Orig. vs. The Tennessee Copper Company et al.

Mr. William L. Frierson in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a Joint motion of the Complainant and defendant Ducktown Sulphur Copper & Iron Company for leave to file stipulation herein and for the entry of an agreed order to be based thereon.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of F. A. Wagner, Trading as The American Mechanical Toy Company, et al., Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioners.

287 The Federal Gas & Fuel Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Columbus Ohio.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry L. Scarlett for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry A. Williams, Mr. L. B. Henning and Mr. Truman L. Eagleson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

122 Bluford Wilson and William Cotter, Receivers of Chicago, Peoria & St. Louis Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Noah Boddy.

In error to the Appellate Court, Second District of the State of Illinois.

Tuesday, January 7th 1919 continued.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed:

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed each party to pay their own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

763 Frank W. Blair,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

764 Allan A. Templeton,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

765 Thomas P. Phillips,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

766 Frank W. Blair,
Appellant,
vs.

767 Alan A. Templeton, Appellant, vs. The United States of America; and

768 Thomas P. Phillips, Appellant, vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that these cases be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday January 27th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

531 J. H. Reeves, Trustee, &c. Petitioner, vs. York Engineering & Supply Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Geo. A. Smith, Mr. J. A. L. Wolfe and Mr. C. W. Williamson for the petitioner and by Mr. W. C. Abbott for the respondent.

650 David D. Mitchell, Petitioner, vs. Harry Mason et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. David D. Mitchell

Tuesday, January 7th 1919 continued.

Owens for the respondents.

754
James A. Murray,
Petitioner,
vs.
H. E. Rupp as Trustee,
&c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Rufus A. Mayer for the petitioner and by Mr. J. A. Peterson for the respondent.

770
Elbridge Hanecy,
Petitioner
vs.
James W. Taylor,
Master &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Elbridge Hanecy, pro se, and by Mr. Alvin H. Culver for the respondent.

783
Olof M. Nevander et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Eleanor M. Ringdal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Silas H. Strawn and Mr. Edward W. Everett for the petitioners and by Mr.

785 Sarah Brester, Petitioner. vs. Mary E. Ludwig and Henry M. Ludwig.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Vinton Pike for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. E. Berns for the respondents.

786 Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner vs. Mary E. Preston

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. B. Linn, and Mr. A. B. Gill for the petitioner.

792 Albert J. Galen, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., Mr. Charles Donnelly, and Mr. M. S. Gunn for the petitioner.

Ex parte: In the Matter of

18 Orig. Muir &c. Petitioner.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert as amicus curiae, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury as amicus curiae.

130 Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Tonopah & Tidewater Railroad Company; and

404 Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Appellant, vs. Chicago Great Western Railroad Company.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Jacob E. Kittle for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, January 8th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal;
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice said:

"Gentlemen of the Bar:

The funeral of Mr. Roosevelt takes place today. The two Houses of Congress have adjourned and, following an order of the President, the departments of the Government will be closed. With these things in mind the Court feels that it cannot transact public business today. It has, therefore, determined to adjourn until tomorrow morning, not only as an loss which the country has suffered, but also as an indication that, at least in spirit, its members will, in union with all his countrymen, sorrowfully follow his remains to their last resting place."

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshall,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Dickson, it is ordered that L. H. Adamson, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Beall it is ordered that Nelson S. Benedict, Esquire, of Washington, admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph M. Shaw it is ordered that G. Gale Gilbert, Esquire, of Mt. Vernon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

314 Great Northern Railway Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Minneapolis Civic & Commerce Association, et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles Donnelly in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to withdraw temporarily original exhibits in the case.

145 J. S. Mullen et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Malinda Pickens et al.;
and
146 L. F. Mullen et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.

On motion of Mr. Francis W. Clements, in behalf of counsel it is ordered that these cases be [illegible] to be cat pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

292	Bluefields Steamship Company, Limited, to the use of Elmer E. Ward, ancillary receiver (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. United Fruit Company.	In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Wherefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

130 Postal Telegraph Cable Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
Monongah & Tidewater Railroad Company.
and
Postal Telegraph Cable Company.

Tuesday, January 7th 1919, continued.

04 vs. Chicago Great Western Railroad Company. The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Jacob E. Ritter for the plaintiff in error and appellant, by Mr. Ralph M. Shaw for the appellee in No. 204, and concluded by Mr. Ode L. Rankin for the plaintiff in error and appellant. No appearance for the defendant in error in No. 130.

217 The Western Union Telegraph Company, Appellant, vs. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Rush Taggart for the appellant, continued by Mr. Charles W. Needham for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by special leave, and concluded by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the appellee.

345 Abraham L. Sugarman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. This cause was argued by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. Seymour Stedman and

Thursday, January 9th 1919 continued

437.
Charles T. Schenck,
plaintiff in error,
vs.
The United States of America.
and
Elizabeth Baer,
plaintiff in error,
438
vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Henry John Nelson for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 10th 1917, continued.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Bettman it is ordered that Alfred V. Geisler, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Minneapolis, St. Paul &
Sault Ste. Marie Railway
Company,

154

vs.
The C. L. Merrick Company.

The motion to permit this case to be heard with case No 659, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Erdall, for the plaintiff in error, and the motion granted.

James A. Keown, Petitioner

628

vs.
Mary E. Keown et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed papers by Mr. J. E. Kahle in behalf of the petitioner.

Talbot Darby Bragg, Plaintiff in Error,

131

vs.
W. S. Weaver, et al.

Passed on account of sickness of counsel.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Successor &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,

134

vs.
Anna A. Porter for herself etc., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Milton E. Lewis and Mr. E.

Friday, January 10th 1919, continued:

437	Charles T. Schenck, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America; and	The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Henry J. Gibbons for the plaintiffs in error.
438	Elizabeth Baer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.	
715	The Columbus Railway Power & Light Company, Appellant, vs. The City of Columbus, Ohio et al., and	These causes were argued by Mr. Joseph S. Clark for the appellants and by Mr. Henry L. Scarlett for the appellees.
439	S. Dukes Burr, et al., partners, &c., Appellants, vs. The City of Columbus, Ohio et al.	
598	Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, Appellant,	

Friday, January 10th 1919, continued.

Clark, Montana
Realty Company
et al.

Two hours were allowed each side for the argument of this cause. The argument was commenced by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the Appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, January 13th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. E. Prussing, it is ordered that Lorraine Wibell Snapp, Esquire, of Joliet, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Walter Bernard Milkman, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Monday, January 13th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that Christie Benet, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that Griffith R. Harsh, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Frank B. Coleman, Esquire, of St Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Meriwether Smith, it is ordered that Ruth Letitia Halpenny, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in

it is ordered that Snowden M. Leftwich, Esquire of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, it is ordered that Ralph Davis, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, it is ordered that Donald Claude Dobbins, Esquire, of Champaign, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

89

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Minnie R. Stewart.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States cuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

A. S. Cohn,
Petitioner
vs.
R. A. Malone, Trustee
of A. S. Cohn, Bankrupt.

96

On writ of certiorari
to the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

97
Mary Cavanaugh and
Jennie Cavanaugh,
Appellants,
vs.
Benj. F. Looney, Attorney
General of the State of
Texas, and the Board
of Regents of the University
of the State of Texas.

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the
Northern Dis-
trict of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed, by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

398
Rebecca Crown,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Forrest Kennedy,

In error to the Court of
Errors and Appeals of
the State of New
Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

357

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Dan Hill.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Detroit United Railway, Appellant, vs. City of Detroit.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

5060

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Candelaria Cordova,
Plaintiff in Error,

Walter B. Trant, late Executor of the Estate of Frank B. Cotton, deceased.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Justice Holmes.)

449 Atlanwilde Transport Corporation vs. Vacuum Oil Company, and

450 Atlanwilde Transport Corporation vs. A. W. Bidwell.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

These causes came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and were

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

79 International Paper Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The Schooner "Gracie D. Chambers," her tackle etc., Florence G. Payne, Claimant.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

115	Standard Varnish Works, vs. Steamship "Bris" Rederiaktiebolaget, Claimant.	On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Wherefore, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

143.	W. N. Fink and C. J. Fleming, as Trustees &c., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County, Oklahoma, et al.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

James H. Cochnower, Appellant,
80 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

131

George S. Fullenwider,
Appellant,
vs
The Southern Pacific
Railroad Company
of California et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

287

The Federal Gas and
Fuel Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
The City of Columbus,
Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig'l. Ex parte In the matter of W. A. Wagner trading as The American Mechanical Toy Company et al., Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig'l. Ex parte In the matter of W. A. Wagner trading as the American Mechanical Toy Company et al., Petitioners.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that cuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and the Judges thereof, The Honorable John W. Warrington, The Honorable Loyal E. Knappen and The Honorable Arthur C. Denison, and by the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio and the Judge thereof, The Honorable Howard C. Hollister, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, March 3rd 1919, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

1 Orig.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
vs.
The Tennessee Copper Company & Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company.

On consideration of the joint motion of the complainant and the defendant Tennessee Copper Company for leave to file a certain contract and stipulation between the said parties concerning the subject matter of this suit.

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted; and, in pursuance of said contract and agreement it is ordered by the Court that the further progress of the cause as re-pany be suspended and continued in accordance with the terms of said stipulation.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
vs.
The Tennessee Copper Company and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company.

On consideration of the joint motion on behalf of the complainant and the defendant Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company for leave to file an agreement and stipulation between said parties.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

It is further ordered in pursuance of said agreement and stipulation, as follows:

(1) That an agreed copy of Georgia Senate Resolution No. 82, passed 1918, and appearing in published acts of Georgia (1918, p. 938) be filed and hereafter constitute a part of the record herein.

(2) An agreed copy of a contract entered into between the State of Georgia and defendants, The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, dated August 20, 1918 this day submitted by the

a part of the record herein.

(3) That pursuant to said resolution and contract, this cause as to said defendant The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, is continued to the October Term 1922, but with leave reserved to the interested parties or either of them, on proper notice and showing, to ask a modification of this order in the meantime, as they may be advised;

(4) That by consent of parties the terms, conditions and limitations in said resolution and contract contained be and they are hereby substituted in lieu and stead of those heretofore imposed by this court, which latter are now modified accordingly.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

168	The United States, Appellant, vs. The Purcell Envelope Company.	On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied, without prejudicing the power of the Court to make such order hereafter on its own motion if so advised

Monday, January 15th 1917, continued.

Matthew W. Chapman et al., Petitioners

56 vs.

John A. Wintroath.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America Appellant

585 vs.

The Southern Pacific Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and this cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. H. Rowe, Trustee of Alliance Mining Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner

31 vs.

York Engineering & Supply Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

650
David F. Mitchell, Petitioner,
vs.
Harry Mason et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

754
James A. Murray, Petitioner,
vs.
H.E. Ray as Trustee of the Estate of Alex Murray, Bankrupt.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

770

Elbridge Haney,
Petitioner,
vs.
James A. Taylor, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Francis G. Porter, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

83

Olof N. [illegible] et al.,
Petitioners
vs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United

Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

785

Sarah Brewster,
Petitioner
vs.
Mary C. Ludwig and
Henry W. Ludwig.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Union Telegraph
Company,

Monday, January 13th 1919, continued.

786 vs.
Mary E. Bristol. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

792
Albert J. Galen, Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.
On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

306 New Orleans Land Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Leader Realty Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Winans Wall and Mr. Gustave Lemle for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles Louque and Mr. W. O. Hart for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

150 Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. California Adjustment Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Wherefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 13th 1919 continued.

The Kansas City Railways Company,
Appellant,
190 vs.
Frank W. McAllister,
Attorney General of Missouri, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Kansas City Railways Company,
Appellant,
191 vs.
Frank W. McAllister,
Attorney General of Missouri, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged suit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

718 The Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The United States. The motion to strike out part of findings of fact and conclusions of law or to remand cause for new findings and conclusions, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Carter Pope for the appellant in support of the motion.

— Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of George E. Hamilton, Petitioner. The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the petitioner.

6 Orig. The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. On motion of Mr. W. A. Jones, in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to open and publish the testimony herein.

Monday, January 13th 1919, continued.

Gin Hock Sue, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America — 40

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles R. Pierce in behalf of Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner and by Mr. G. Carroll Todd and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent. ( )

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. O. W. Scarp — 54

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage and Mr. R. J. Roberts for the petitioner.

L. Cass Miller et als., Appellants, vs. John Wiethaupt et al. — 36

Passed, on account of the sickness of counsel, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 7, rule

26.

598

Butte & Superior
Copper Company,
(Limited),
Appellant,
vs.
Clark-Montana
Realty Company, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. H. Dickson for the appellant, by Mr. John P. Gray for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, January 14th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney, } Associate Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Scott, it is ordered that William A. Schnader, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis H. Stephens, it is ordered that Robert L. Williams, Esquire, of mitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Whelan it is ordered that Milton L. Corey, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Miller it is ordered that Archibald H. Vernon, Esquire, of Little Falls, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway it is ordered that Robert A. [illegible], Esquire, of Russellville, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

G. S. Nicholas &
Company, et al.,
Petit[illegible]

Tuesday, January 14th 1919 continued.

62. vs.
The United States.
and
Alex. D. Shaw & Company, et al.,
Petitioners
63 vs.
The United States.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. W. P. Preble for Shaw & Company et al., continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hanson for the United States and concluded by Mr. Albert H. Washburn for Nicholas & Co., et al.

Corn Products Refining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
119 vs.
W. O. Eddy et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. T. M. Lillard for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. J. L. Hunt for the defendant in error.

Elvie Wheeler, by his next friend P. V. Wheeler
Plaintiff in Error,
120 vs.
Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Buford C. Tynes for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John Galvin and by Mr. Edward Colston for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, January 14th 1919, continued.

Wirt K. Winton, Administrator &c., et al.,
Appellants,
123 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. S. Boundes, attorney in fact for T. A. Boundes,
Appellants,
124 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

John London,
Appellant,
125 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

Walter S. Field et al.,
Appellants,
126 vs.
Jack Amos and others known as the Mississippi Choctaws;

27 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws;

William H. Vernon,
Appellant,
28 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws; and

Katie A. Howe, Executrix,
&c., Appellant,
29 vs.
Jack Amos and others
known as the Mississippi
Choctaws.

Three and one half hours allowed to counsel for the appellants for the argument of these causes. The argument was commenced by Mr. William H. Scott for the appellant in No. 123,

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, January 15th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

(Present:)

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. S. Womble, it is ordered that Charles A. Vogler, Esquire, of Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Charles Wesley Dunn, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Biddison, it is ordered that Frank C. Walling Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones it is ordered that Henry P. Burney Esquire of San Antonio, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

82 Bessie Dyneth, nee Offutt et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles B. Shaffer et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of Court by Mr. Francis W. Clements in behalf of counsel for the respondents.

23 Hart K. Winton, Administratrix &c, et al., Appellants, vs. Jack Amos and other [illegible]

Wednesday, January 15th 1919 (continued)

J. S. Bounds, (Attorney,)
(in Fact for W. A. Bounds,
Appellant,
124
vs.
Jack Amos and others known
as the Mississippi Choctaws;

John London, Appellant,
125
vs.
Jack Amos and others known
as the Mississippi Choctaws;

Walter S. Wild et al.,
Appellants,
126
vs.
Jack Amos and others known
as the Mississippi Choctaws;

J. J. Beckham, Appellant,
127
vs.
Jack Amos and others known
as the Mississippi Choctaws;

William B. Vernon,
Appellant,
128
vs.
Jack Amos and others known
as the Mississippi Choctaws;
and
Katie A. Howe, Executrix:

Wednesday, January 15th 1919, continued.

29 vs. Eight Cases and others known as the Mississippi Sections.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. William W. Scott for the appellants in No. 123, by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in Nos. 124 to 127, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson for the appellees, by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellants in Nos 124 to 129, and concluded by Mr. William W. Scott for the appellants in No 123.

132 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company et al., Petitioners vs. J. G. Leach.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William W. Crawford for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, January 16th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, } Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, it is ordered that Stevens Heckscher, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and John M. Markley, Esquire, of Georgetown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. J. McLaurine, it is ordered that

Thursday, January 16th 1919 continued.

of Jackson, State of Mississippi be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. McCroden it is ordered that George M. Beahley, Esquire of Phoenix, State of Arizona be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Elston, it is ordered that Cornelius H. Kelly, Esquire, [illegible], State of [illegible], be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Campbell it is ordered that J. Sydney Salkey, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Maggie L. Lukens,
(Shorthand Reporter)

International Life Insurance Company.

Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

132 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. J. G. Leach.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William H. Crawford for the Petitioners, by Mr. Frank W. Hackett for the respondent and concluded by Mr. William H. Crawford for the Petitioners.

137 Pierce Oil Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Hope.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed

Ross and Mr. J. T. Loughborough for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

38 The Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Collins Produce Company. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Homer T. Dick and Mr. Lindorf O. Whitnel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. D. Gale Talbot, Mr. Charles A. Wham and Mr. Fred L. Wham, for the defendant in error.

39 Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. N. Reynolds. This cause was argued by Mr. William A. Schnader for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. B. S. Womble, and Mr. W. M. Hendren for the defendant in error.

567 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. A. Dossman. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the

Printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. H. C. Stevens for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

370 W. S. Webb et al. vs. The United States of America. This cause was argued by Mr. Ralph W. Davis, for Webb et al, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the United States.

141 Anna W. Mattes, Appellant, vs. Margaret Ryan. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Roger Sherman, and Mr. Harry A. Parkin for the appellant. No appearance for the appellee.

142 William A. Withnell, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ruecking Construction Company. This cause was argued by Mr. Frank B. Coleman for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. E. T. Allen and Mr. C. B. Allen for the plaintiff in error.

Thursday, January 16th 1919, continued.

3. Corsicana National Bank of Corsicana, Plaintiff in error, vs. Samuel Wistar Johnson.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick, for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Cullen F. Thomas, Mr. W. J. McKie and Mr. Henry C. Coke, for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 17th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

(Present:)

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Baldwin, it is ordered that N. S. Wilson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Pam, it is ordered that Clarence Wood, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he

Friday, January 17th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. S. P. Spencer, it is ordered that H. L. Cole, Esquire, of Union, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

19
Missouri & Arkansas Lumber & Mining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Greenwood District of Sebastian County, Arkansas et al.

This cause was submitted to to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John H. Vaughan, and Mr. B. R. Davidson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the defendants in error.

52
Douglas Park Jockey Club,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. N. Talbot et al., composing Kentucky State Racing Commission.

This cause was continued to the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

56
The United States
Petitioner
vs.

This cause was passed, per stipulations of counsel

158

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 7, rule 26, on motion of Mr. F. Carter Pope in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

141

American Steel Foundries, Petitioner,
vs.
The Tri-city Central Trades Council, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Max Pam for the petitioner and by Mr. F. C. Smith for the respondents.

147

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer, &c., Appellants,
vs.
The Pioneer Irrigation Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ralph E. Carpenter for the appellant and by Mr. Edwin H. Park for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, January 20th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that J. Crawford Biggs, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that Robert W. Burke, Esquire,

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin [illegible], it is ordered that Robert C. Poskanzer, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. R. Ogilby, it is ordered that Louis J. de Milhau, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that Claude W. Ritter, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed it is ordered that [illegible] of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. William W. Hastings, it is ordered that Thomas W. Leahy, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Axelroad, it is ordered that Henry L. Phillips, Esquire of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold L. Bodamer, it is ordered that Thomas D. Quinn, Esquire, of St Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. O. Bland, it is ordered

Petersburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Pitt Campbell, it is ordered that Edward C. Pitch, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

130 Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Tonopah and Tidewater Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department, of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice

Monday, January 20th 1919, continued.

17

The Western Union Telegraph Company, Appellant,
vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

04

Postal Telegraph Cable Company, Appellant,
vs.
Chicago Great Western Railroad

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Th

transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

141

Philip La Tourette,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
Fitz Hugh McMaster, as
Insurance Commissioner
of the State of South Carolina.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is

J. Homer Fritch,
Incorporated; E. T. Rouse;
Mary Batt Parker Burns,
et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error
64
vs.
The United States.

In error to
the United
States Cir-
cuit Court
of Appeals
for the Ninth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to dismiss for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elmer Wheeler by his
next friend, R. G. Wheeler,
Plaintiff in Error,
20
vs.
Cincinnati, New Orleans
& Texas Pacific Railway
Company.

In error to the
Court of Ap-
peals of the
State of
Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

139 Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. N. Reynolds. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

575 Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant, vs.

E. B. Howard, State Auditor, et al.

The suggestion having been made that the case has become moot by the expiration of the official terms of the State officers who were defendants below & who are appellees here, the attention of counsel of both parties is called to the suggestion and information from them on the subject is requested.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of George E. Hamilton, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bessie Pyeatt, now Offutt, P. B. Pyeatt and John O. Mitchell, Petitioners,

682 vs.

Charles B. Shaffer et al., Respondents.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the

No. 167.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

628 James A. Keown, Petitioner, vs. Mary E. Keown, Margaret A. Hughes, and James J. Hughes.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

748 The Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motions to strike out part of the findings in this cause, or to remand for new findings.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

780 Michael Coyser, Petitioner, vs. Elizabeth J. Graiton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of

Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tim Wock Sue, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

10

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alvah Crocker et als.,
Trustees,

641 John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Orig'l Ex parte: In the Matter of Robert W. Kinney, Petitioner. The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert W. Kinney, pro se.

731 E. W. Bliss Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. The suggestion of diminution of the records and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Calvin I. Milans in behalf of Mr. Arthur C. Fraser for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson and Mr. Henry E. Workman for the appellee.

161 Southern Pacific Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Newman. This case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant

rule 26, on motion of Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the plaintiffs in error.

54 John E. Hartenbower, and George W. Hillabrand, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Edward C. Fitch in behalf of Mr. Edward J. Brundage and Mr. James H. Wilkerson for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry A. Rhine for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

58 Ed. C. Lasater, Petitioner, vs. Magnolia Petroleum Company, et al.

The motion for an extension of time in which to prepare and file printed copies of petition for certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of Mr. W. E. Pope, for the petitioner.

Metropolitan Trust Company of the City of New York,

787

vs.
Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Frank H. Scott, Mr. Brode B. Davis, and Mr. Royall Victor for the petitioner and by Mr. John S. Miller, Mr. George Edward Murray, Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt and Mr. Roberts Walker, for the respondents.

794

Albert Lee More and Edward E. Carriere,
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charlton R. Beattie and Mr. George Wesley Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

800

Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen,
Petitioner,
vs.
Sallie Ann Graves.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court arguments by Mr. Henry P. Blair and Mr. Arthur Hellen for the petitioner and by Mr. W. Gwynne Gardiner for the respondent.

356 The United States ex rel.
George W. Bitterman,
Appellant,
vs.
Matthew J. Long, Criminal
Sheriff, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas Lee Woolwine for the appellee in support of the motion.

162 Oelwerke Teutonia,
Appellant,
vs.
Erlanger & Galinger;
and
Erlanger & Galinger,
Appellants,
181 vs.
Oelwerke Teutonia.

These causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument, by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke for Oelwerke Teutonia, and by Mr. A. C. Fisher for Erlanger and Galinger.

8 Gratiot County State Bank,
Petitioner

D. Lloyd Johnson, Trustee, &c. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William L. C. de Pointer and Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson for the Petitioner and by Mr. Edward J. Mounet and Mr. William A. Bahlke for the respondent.

151 Alaska Salmon Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Territory of Alaska. — This cause was argued by Mr. George B. Grigsby for the defendant and submitted by Mr. Warren Gregory, Mr. E. S. McCord and Mr. W. H. Bogle for the plaintiff in Error.

153 Elmira Van Buskirk, as Administratrix, &c. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Erie Railroad Company. — This cause was argued by Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the Plaintiff in error and by Mr. George S. Hobart for the defendant in error.

155 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Brooklyn Eastern — This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the pe-

Henry Blossom for the defendant.

159 Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs A. C. Ochs, doing business under the name of, A. C. Ochs Brick & Tile Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Richard L. Kennedy for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Henry C. Flannery for the defendant in Error.

160 Large Oil Company Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. B. Howard, State Auditor &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank B. Burford for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, it is ordered that Clare J. Hall, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Scott it is ordered that Thomas J. O'Neill, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that Richard P. Daniel, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, and G. Bertram Woodruff, Esquire, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Horrigan it is ordered that Arthur J. Hecker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and John J. Hughes, Esquire, of Benton, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. T. Dowling, it is ordered that E. J. Kirby, Esquire, of Wagoner, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

68 The United States,
Appellant.

The Purcell Envelope Company.

On motion of Mr. C. A. R. Ogilby in behalf of counsel it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

682. Bessie Tyrrell nee Offutt et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles B. Shaffer et al.

It is ordered that this cause be reassigned for argument on March 3d next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

173. The Harriman National Bank of New York, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harry H. Seldomridge, as receiver &c.

It is ordered that this cause be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

171. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Police Court of the City of Sacramento, State of California et al.

This cause was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

Tuesday, January 21st 1919, continued.

60

Large Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
E.B. Howard, State Auditor, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank B. Burford for the plaintiff in error and concluded by Mr. John B. Harrison for the defendant in error.

163

Central of Georgia Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
William A. Wright, Comptroller General of Georgia.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. M. Cunningham, Jr. and Mr. A.R. Lawton for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Samuel H. Sibley for the defendant in error.

67

Thomas Gilcrease,
Petitioner
v.
G.R. McCullough et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A.J. Biddison for the petitioner and by Mr. James B. Diggs for the respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer it is ordered that John R. Gruenbrenner, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney, and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Magee, it is ordered that Albert Y. Wilkinson, Esquire, of Camden, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney, and counsellor of this Court

Wednesday, January 22d 1919, continued:

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fiorello H. La Guardia, it is ordered that Joseph Nicchia, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm M. Whelan, it is ordered that George P. Faulk, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Orig'l Ex parte: In the Matter of Albert Paul Fricke, Petitioner

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Scott in behalf of Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner.

178 Dominion Hotel Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Arizona

On motion of Mr. Harvey, Mr. Armond for the plaintiff in error it is ordered that this cause be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

5303

134

The New York Central Railroad Company, successor etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Anna C. Porter, for herself, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. A. T. Wilkinson for the defendants in error leave is hereby granted the defendants in error to file brief in this cause.

218

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Company.

On motion of Mr. Gregory L. Smith it is ordered that this cause be assigned for hearing with No. 176.

180

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas,
Appellant,
vs.
Alhambra Cigar and Cigarette Manufacturing Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. F. C. Fisher for the appellant and by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke for the appellee.

169 Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Appellant, vs. City of Richmond. This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Sibbitt, Jr., for the appellant and by Mr. H.R. Pollard for the appellee.

170 Union Tank Line, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William A. Wright, Comptroller General of Georgia. This cause was argued by Mr. Douglas Campbell for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Clifford Walker for the defendant in error.

172. Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Petitioners, vs. E. W. McComas. This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Donnelly for the petitioners and by Mr. Harvey M. Friend for the respondent.

175 The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James R. Baird. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record with leave to counsel for the

uary 1st and to counsel for defendant in error to file brief on or before February 15th next.

176
Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company, and

248
Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant
vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the appellant and plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, January 23d, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorables Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that Louis B. Boudin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush Taggart it is ordered that Elmer W. Demarest, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that Carl E. Kitze, Esquire, of Mayville, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Claude Smith, Esquire, of Caddo, Walter J. Turnbull, Esquire, and William F. Semple, Esquire, of Durant, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas McKeown it is ordered that Leonard W. Lewis, Esquire, of Hobart, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

186 William H. Odell,
Appellant,
vs.
F. C. Farnsworth Company, et al.

On motion of Mr. Frank A. Kane, it is ordered that this case be passed pursuant to the 26th rule.

Seufert Brothers Company,

187 vs.
The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., et al.;
and
The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., et al.
Appellants,
188 vs.
Seufert Brothers Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for The United States etc., et al, it is ordered that these cases be passed pursuant to the 26th rule.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
183 vs.
Louis Block.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Rudolph W. Bumgardner for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. V. R. Shackelford for the defendant in error.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Appellant
176 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.
and

Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

248

vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the appellant and plaintiff in error by Mr. Rush Taggart for the appellee and defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the appellant and plaintiff in error.

Standard Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

177

vs.
H. T. Graves and
H. T. Graves as Commissioner of Agriculture etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oscar Sutro for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. L. L. Thompson for the defendant in error.

J. W. Boxley,
Plaintiff in Error,

182

vs.
E. M. Scott et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Harry H. Rogers for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William G. Lingston for the defendants in error.

184 James E. Whitehead, (Plaintiff in Error, vs. James O. Galloway et al. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Claude S. Arnold, for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the defendants in error.

185 Oklahoma Gin Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma. On motion of Mr. S. P. Freeling for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to file brief for the defendant in error within twenty days and reply brief for the plaintiff in error within five days thereafter.

185 Oklahoma Gin Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma; and

194 The Oklahoma Operating Company, Appellant, vs. J. E. Love et al., etc. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. C. B. Ames for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Friday, January 24th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Frank C. Wilson, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Taylor, it is ordered that Victor E. Keyes, Esquire, of Greeley, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor he was sworn accordingly. ( )

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that George B. Logan, Esquire, of St. Louis, and Joseph W. Shewalter, Esquire, of Independence, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly. ( )

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. R. Kirby it is ordered that Horace Chamberlin, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ( )

Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
192 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King, for the defendant in error it is ordered that this cause be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

[illegible]

Friday, January 24th 1919 continued.

711
vs.
The United States

On motion of Mr. Moses E. Clapp in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file brief of Gilbert E. Roe as amicus curiae in this cause.

Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior,
et al.,
Appellants
1911
vs.
Central Pacific Railway
Company.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Northern Pacific Railway
Company,
Appellant,
176
vs.
Franklin K. Lane Secretary
of the Interior.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Oklahoma Gin Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
185
vs.
The State of Oklahoma.
and
The Oklahoma Operating
Company,
Appellant
1191
vs.
J. E. Love et al., etc.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the defendant in error and appellees and concluded by for the plaintiff in error and appellant.)

179
John Kenney, Petitioner,
vs.
Laban Miles et al., Administrators &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General King, for the petitioner and by Mr. H. P. White for the respondent.)

184
Adelbert Harris, by his next friend Albert Harris.
vs.
The District of Columbia.

This cause was argued by Mr. Rossa F. Downing for Harris and by Mr. Robert L. Williams and Mr. Francis H. Stephens for the District of Columbia).

191
Andrew W. Barbour, Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The State of Georgia).

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. A. Lawrence and Mr. W. W. Osborne for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Clifford Walker for the defendant in error.)

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Monday, January 27th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, it is ordered that William P. Maloney, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Parker Jones, it is ordered that James A. Reed, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, William W. Eton, Esquire, of Columbia, and Edward A. Foley, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Calver, it is ordered that Arthur W. Calver, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, Herman P. Gammons, Esquire, and Arthur B. Marsh, Esquire, of Haverhill, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wayne Anderson, it is ordered that James E. Cannon, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Hanley, it is ordered that Ray J. Madden, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

Monday, January 27th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Hollingsworth, it is ordered that Ernest Sidney McNamee, Esquire, of Cadiz, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Lindsay, it is ordered that Owen N. Brown, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew W. McKenney, it is ordered that Louis V. Crowley, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram P. White, it is ordered that Andrew Joyce, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Louis A. W. Hagner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ( )

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Dietz it is ordered that Harry H. Muller, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, and Francis L. Boutell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as ~~an~~ attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly. ( )

The United States of
America and Mrs.
Josephine Brown,
Appellants,
164 vs.
New Orleans Pacific
Railway Company, W.
R. Pickering Lumber
Company and River
Land & Lumber Com
pany. ( )

Appeal from the
United States Cir
cuit Court of Ap
peals for the Fifth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America and William R. Thomas,
Appellants,
165 vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company and W. R. Pickering Lumber Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit

Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America and Stephen M. Grant,
Appellants,
66 vs.
New Orleans Pacific Railway Company, W. R. Pickering Lumber Company and South Land Lumber Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now

this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is partly affirmed as to S. ½ of N. W. ¼ of Sec 3, T. 3 N. R. 7 W., L. M. and reversed as to the other lands; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

56

Mount St. Mary's Cemetery Association,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William C. Mullins.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Monday, January 27th 1919, continued.

37

Pierce Oil Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of Hope.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

62

The Bank of California National Association,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Friend William Richardson, as Treasurer of the State of California.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this preme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

115 The Bank of California, National Association, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
E. W. Roberts, Treasurer of the State of California.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Elmira Van Buskirk, Administratrix of the Estate of William Van Buskirk, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, 153 vs. Erie Railroad Company.	In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Large Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
60 vs.
E. B. Howard, State

Oklahoma. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

182. J. W. Boxley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. E. M. Scott and Franklin Chaney. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

83 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company and Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Louis Block.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

306 New Orleans Land Company and Lakeview Land Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Leader Realty Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

681

John E. Hartenbower and
George W. Hiltabrand,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Ex parte: In the Matter of Albert W. Kinney, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter of Albert Paul Rucke, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

38 Ed. C. Lasater, Petitioner

vs.

Magnolia Petroleum Company, First State Bank of Corpus Christi, et al.

On consideration of the motion for an extension of time in which to print the petition for a writ of certiorari heretofore submitted;

It is now here ordered by the Court

is hereby granted, and the time is extended to and including February 3d next.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

731

E. W. Bliss Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motions for a writ of certiorari or suggestion of diminution of the record,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied without prejudice.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

619

Alvah Crocker et al.,
Trustees,
Petitioners,
vs.
John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Supreme Conclave,
Improved Order of
Heptasophs,
(Plaintiff in Error,
373 vs.
William Marshall Wilson.

This case
having here
tofore been
ordered
placed on
the summary
docket, it is
assigned for argument on Monday
March 3rd next, at the head of the call
for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Metropolitan Trust Com
pany of the City of New
York, Trustee, &c.,
Petitioner
787 vs.
Chicago and Eastern Illi
nois Railroad Company,
Thomas D. Heed, as Re
ceiver, Railway Steel Spring
Company (et al).

On petition
for writ of
certiorari to the
United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for
a writ of certiorari herein to the United
States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of
counsel thereupon had, as well in support
of as against the same, it is now
here ordered by this Court that the

5313

hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Albert Le More and Edward E. Garrison, Petitioners, vs. The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

799

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Petitioner, vs. Sallie Ann Graves.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

800

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice also announced that the court will take a recess from Monday, February 3 next, to Monday, March 3 next.

227 Ball Engineering Company, Petitioner, vs. J. G. White & Company. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief for the United States as amicus curiae in this cause.

815 The Commercial Cable Company, Appellant, vs. Albert S. Burleson et al. and Commercial Pacific Cable Company, Appellant,
76 vs. Albert S. Burleson et al.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

419

R. A. Flanders, as Trustee, etc.,
Appellant,
vs.
E. J. Coleman.

The motion to place this cause on the Summary docket was submitted to the considerations of the Court by Mr. Alexander C. King in behalf of Mr. C. S. Bradley and Mr. Frederick A. Sawyer for the appellant.

179

John Kinney,
Petitioner,
vs.
Laban Miles et al.,
Administrators, etc.

On motion of Mr. H. T. White for the respondents leave is hereby granted to file supplemental brief for the respondents herein within three days.

441

The United States ex rel. William F. Grant,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the considerations of the Court by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley for the Plaintiff in error.

— Orig. In the Matter of Albert Herschie de Proffer

Suggestions of the Committee heretofore appointed herein was submitted to the

the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Charles W. Needham and Mr. Melville Church in its behalf and on printed brief by Mr. Albert Herschel de Poffer, pro se.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Petitioner,
821
vs.
George W. Brisco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Gordon Bohannon for the petitioner and by Mr. David H. Leake for the respondent.

Kate Richard O'Hare, Petitioner,
798
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Vernon E. West in behalf of Mr. Chester H. Krum for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Fox Typewriter Company, Petitioner,
801
vs.
August J. Dehning et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-

Mr. Fred. L. Chappell for the petitioner and by Mr. Hans v. Briesen for the respondent.

811

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Barney King.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Robert M. Simmons and Mr. William B. Rodman for the petitioner.

198.

The United States of America ex rel. Alaska Smokeless Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane as Secretary of the Interior et al.

On motion of Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered that this cause be passed.

667

James A. Peterson Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error it is ordered that this cause be passed.

Monday, January 27th 1919, continued.

223 Alfred W. Church, Appellant, vs. Horace M. Swetland, et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. John S. Parker for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Hector M. Hitchings for the appellant in opposition thereto.

685 Jacob Frohwerk, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist and Mr. Joseph D. Shewalter for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant in error, and leave granted Mr. Joseph D. Shewalter to file an additional brief for the plaintiff in error within two days.

714 Eugene V. Debs, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Seymour Stedman for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, January 28th 1919 continued

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
(Associate Justices)

Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Robert H. Terrell, it is ordered that Rufus Sea Stout of Los Angeles, State of California and Perri W. Frisby of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Sexton it is ordered that Francis S. Wilson, Esquire, and Matthias Concannon, Esquire, Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Albert Saylor, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

201 The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
The Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

701 Eugene V. Hale,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States.
in error.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the defendant

Frank W. Blair
Plaintiff in Error,
703 vs.
[illegible]

Tuesday, January 28th 1919, continued.

764 Allan A. Templeton,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

765 Thomas P. Phillips,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

766 Frank W. Blair,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America;

767 Allan A. Templeton,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America;
and

768 Thomas P. Phillips,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America.

These causes were argued by Mr. Martin W. Littleton for the plaintiffs in error and appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the defendant in error and appellee.

190	Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error vs. H. N. Gallup et al. &c.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed temporarily.
193	Savannah & Northwestern Railway et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Maggie Roach, Administratrix &c.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed temporarily.
195	The City of Richmond, Petitioner vs. Elizabeth W. Bird et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George Wayne Anderson for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. James E. Cannon for the respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, January 24th 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Clarence N. Goodwin, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois and J. Robert Anderson, Esquire, of Parkersburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, it is ordered that Frank R. Hubachek, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. H. Kelley, it is ordered that Robert H. Lane, Esquire of Bay City, and Gilbert A. Currie, Esquire of Midland, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. Whelan, it is ordered that W. C. Geiselman, Esquire, of Geneva, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores it is ordered that C. A. Whitehead, Esquire, of Warsaw, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, it is ordered that James A. Stephens, Esquire, of Benjamin, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

202

Southern Oregon Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

It is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby continued per stipulation of counsel.

201

Lake Erie & Western Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois ex rel., J. S. Cameron.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

195

The City of Richmond,
Petitioner
vs.
Elizabeth M. Bird et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James E. Cannon for the respondent and concluded by Mr. George Wayne Anderson for the petitioner.

Wednesday, January 29th 1919, continued.

197 Franklin Knight Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The Pueblo of Santa Rosa.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellants, and by Mr. Ralph S. Rounds for the appellee.

187 Seufert Brothers Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., et als.
and
188 The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., et als.,
Appellants,
vs.
Seufert Brothers Company.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. H. S. Wilson for Seufert Brothers Company and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the United States &c., et als.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock.

Thursday January 30th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Evans, it is ordered that Arthur P. Carpenter, Esquire, of Brattleboro, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Stevenson it is ordered that John J. Bouhan, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert Fisher, it is ordered that Henry Minor, Esquire, of Macon, and Garrard Harris, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmont B. Hazard, it is ordered that Phillip W. Haberman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Daniels, it is ordered that C. M. King, Esquire, of Blue River, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Daniels it of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler it is ordered that H. H. Russell, Esquire, of Westerville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. H. Gallup and D. M. Fisher, partners trading as Gallup & Fisher.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

190

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Savannah & Northwestern Railway and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,
193 vs.
Maggie Roach, Administratrix of the Estate of John W. Roach, deceased.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

L. C. Watson, as trustee, &c.
Plaintiff in Error,
206 vs.
George W. Motley.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Rutherford Lapsley for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. George W. Motley for the defendant in error.

Thursday, January 30th 1919, continued.

187 Seufert Brothers Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., et al.; and

188 The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Seufert Brothers Company.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the United States &c., et al., and concluded by Mr. H. S. Wilson for Seufert Brothers Company.

194 The United States, Appellant vs. The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellant and by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellee.

200 The United States, Appellant vs. Robert A. Laughlin.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. Edward Wright for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Francis W. Cle-

Thursday, January 30th 1919, continued

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 31st 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion C. Early it is ordered that Everett Paul Griffin, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert A. Wray, it is ordered that Isaac Shaw, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney

sworn accordingly.

828 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Colgate & Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the plaintiff in error.

210 Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, vs. The United States.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

200 The United States, Appellant, vs. Robert A. Laughlin.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. C. Edward Wright for the appellant.

173. The Harriman National Bank of New York, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harry H. Seldomridge, as Receiver, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Stuart G. Gibboney for the defendant in error.

Panama Railroad Company,

Friday, January 31st 1919, continued.

203 vs. Theodore Bosse. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frank Reville for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Theodore C. Hinckley and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the defendant in error.

205 The United States, Appellant, vs. A. H. Heyward et al., administrators, &c. This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant and by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, February 3rd 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol:

Present:

The honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Henderson it is ordered that Carl P. Goepel, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that David Andrew Pine, Esquire, of Washington, District

an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. A. Hollingsworth, it is ordered that Barclay W. Moore, Esquire, of Cadiz, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, it is ordered that Arthur L. Adams, Esquire, of Blytheville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, it is ordered that William Acker Smith, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

162 Alberto Gutierrez,
Appellant,
vs.

and
Erlanger & Galinger,
Appellants,
181 vs.
Oelwerke Teutonia.

Appeals from the
Supreme Court of
the Philippine
Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands on appeal and cross-appeal and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; each party to pay one-half of the costs in this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Central of Georgia
Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
63 vs.
William A. Wright, Comptroller General of the State of Georgia.

In error to
the Supreme
Court of the
State of
Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

441 The United States ex rel. William F. Grant, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

815 The Commercial Cable Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Albert S. Burleson and
Newcomb Carlton

Monday, February 3d 1919, continued.

The Commercial Pacific Cable Company, Appellant, vs. Albert S. Burleson and Newcomb Carlton.

816

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Colgate & Company.

828

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

F. R. Glascock and The Corning Investment Company, Petitioners

826

Ettie McDaniel et al. minors, by J. C. Evans, guardian.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. W. C. Sullivan in behalf of Mr. William B. Moore and Mr. George S. Ramsey for the petitioners.

779

Oneida Navigation Corporation, claimant, etc., Appellant,
vs.
W. & S. Job & Company, Incorporated.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Thomas Dunlop in behalf of Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr. for the appellant.

731

Louis W. Hill, Administrator, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Newton A. K. Bugbee, comptroller &c., et al.

The motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 245 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Asher Smith in behalf of Mr. Joseph Buell for the plaintiff in error.

Monday, February 3rd 1919, continued.

Frank M. Darling,
Plaintiff in Error,
600 vs.
The City of Newport News.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Winston Read for the plaintiff in error.

Carolina Spruce Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
527 vs.
Black Mountain Railway Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr Justice McKenna.)

Atlanta National Bank,
Petitioner
812 vs.

Trustee, etc. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jack J. Spalding for the Petitioner and by Mr. Luther Z. Rosser for the respondent.

817 James Kenney, Petitioner, vs The United States of America. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in behalf of Mr. J. R. Mahaffy, Mr. John J. King and Mr. W. L. Estes for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

830 Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs New Jersey Fidelity & Plate Glass Insurance Company. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Gilbert Collins, Mr.

Monday, February 3rd 1919 continued:

Mr. George S. Hobart and Mr. Charles A. Boston for the petitioner and by Mr. Jeremiah P. Hoover for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, March 3rd next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 3rd 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Mark Goode, Esquire, of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma; Paul R. Wagner, Esquire, of Mont Clair, State of Pennsylvania; George R. Allen, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas; and Thomas F. Green, Esquire, of Athens, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, March 3rd, 1919, continued:

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Raker, it is ordered that Meyer London, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Raker, it is ordered that W. L. Pollard, Esquire, of Los Angeles, Charles Elvan Musick, Esquire, of Pasadena, State of California, and E. P. Van Court, Esquire, of Eufaula, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isidore B. Dockweiler, it is ordered that Kenneth M. Ham, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Crago, it is ordered that Harry A. Cottom, Esquire, of Brownsville, and Peter M. Speer, Es-

be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Glegnall Todd, it is ordered that William St. John Noyes, Esquire, of New York City; Arthur C. Schenck, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; George P. Steele, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado; Ray E. Lane, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and Lloyd T. Williams, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. M. Neely, it is ordered that G. W. Burton, Esquire, of Crosbyton, State of Texas and William Beard, Esquire, of Parkersburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Pierson, it is ordered that Robert Bryan Barnett, Monday March 3rd 1919, continued.

ssee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Rainey, it was ordered that Emory J. Smith, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. C. Hilliard, it is ordered that Albert G. Craig, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. H. La Guardia, it is ordered that Lemuel Ely Quigg, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Alden

Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Y. Webb, it is ordered that William Schley Howard, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, Walter L. Hensley, Esquire, of Farmington, and Courtney W. Hamlin, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Hintemute W. Sloan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. R. Galloway, it is ordered that John Raeburn Green, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri and Randolph C. Shaw, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. D. McKeown, it is ordered that George P. Glass, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. G. Buchanan, it is ordered that Alan Johnstone, Jr., Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, Ira E. Meek, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Timothy N. Pfeiffer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Sloan, it is ordered that William E. Flynn, Esquire, of North Platte, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chicago & Eastern
Illinois Railroad Com-
pany,

153 vs. Collins Produce Company. — Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

187 Seufert Brothers Company, Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian of the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indians and Nations et al.

as Trustee and Guardian
of the Confederated Tribes
& Bands of the Yakima In-
dians and Nation, et al.,
Appellants,
188 vs
Seufert Brothers Company.

Appeals from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the Dis-
trict of
Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal of the United States of America, as Trustee and Guardian etc., be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Thomas Gilmore,
Petitioner
67 vs.
G. R. McCullough, W. B.
Martin, A. E. Bradshaw,
and A. L. Brown.

On writ of certio-
rari to the Su-
preme Court of
the State of
Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

315 Abraham L. Sugarman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Monday, March 3rd 1919, continued:

The New York Central Railroad Company, successor of the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Anna C. Porter, for herself and her four minor children, Margaret Porter, Jack Porter, Adele Porter, and Clarisse Porter, et al.

34

In error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

117

Missouri & Arkansas Lumber & Mining Company, Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Greenwood District of Sebastian County, Arkansas, Claude Thompson, as Sheriff, and Marshall Sturgis, as Treasurer.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

195

The City of Richmond, Petitioner,
vs.
Elizabeth W. Bird, Louise M. Nolting, and Charles E. Whitlock.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ex parte: In the matter of Whitney Steamboat Corporation,
Petitioner.
26 Orig.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of prohibition and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that said rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

53

North Pacific Steamship Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Hall Brothers Marine Railway and Shipbuilding Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

73

Robert H. Werk, and Robert H. Werk and Mrs. John Louis Kennedy, copartners doing business under the name of Robert H. Werk & Company,
Petitioners,
vs.
A. Thomas Parker and J. Thomas Roby, copartners doing business under the

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Monday, March 5th 1917, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Arkadelphia Milling
Company,
Appellant,
92 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Rail
way Company and St. Louis
Iron Mountain & Southern
Railway Company.

Joseph K. Hasty, Eliphalet
K. Hasty and William C. Hasty,
composing the partnership of
J. K. Hasty & Sons,
Appellants

St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company and
St. Louis, Iron Mountain
& Southern Railway Com-
pany.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain
& Southern Railway Com-
pany et al.,
Appellants,
94. vs.
The Southern Cotton Oil
Company, and

St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
95 vs.
The Southern Cotton Oil
Company.

Appeals from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the East-
ern District
of Arkansas.

These causes came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas on separate appeals, and were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said appellants The Arkadelphia Milling Company and J.K. Hardy & Sons, be, and the same are hereby reversed with costs; and as to the appellants The Railway Companies be modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that these causes be, and the same are hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

02 Charlie Middleton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Texas Power & Light Company.	In error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

111 Chicago Great Western Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
L. W. Basham, Administrator of the Estate of John J. Spellman, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

50 L. A. Westermann Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Dispatch Printing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

now ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

[illegible]

Franklin Knight Lane,
Secretary of the Interior,
and Clay Tallman,
Commissioner of the General
Land Office,
Appellants,
97 vs.
The Pueblo of Santa Rosa.

Appeal from
the Court of
Appeals of
the District
of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said Court of Appeals and of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in

5334

reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to overrule the motion to dismiss, to afford the defendants an opportunity to answer the bill, to grant an order restraining them from in any wise offering, listing or disposing of any of the lands in question pending the final decree, and to take such further proceedings as may be appropriate and not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

117
Alaska Pacific Fisheries, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

13 Alaska Pacific Fisheries,
(Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Justice Day.)

51 Alaska Salmon Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now

that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Justice Day.)

142 William H. Whitmire, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ruecking Construction Company. — Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Day.)

180 Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Appellant, vs. Alhambra Cigar and Cigarette Manufacturing Company. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

184 James E. Whitehead, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James O. Galloway, Winfield S. Presgrove, The Maritime Insurance Company and the Atkinson, Nelson & Henley Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

367 The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
C. T. Doremus.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and
reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby,
the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds

370 W. S. Webb and Jacob Goldbaum,
vs.
The United States.

On a certificate from the

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court, that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative, and the second and third questions in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

(Per Mr. Justice Clarke.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice McReynolds

203 Panama Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Andreas Bosse.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

(Per Mr. Justice Holmes.)

437 Charles T. Schenck, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States of America. | In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

38

Elizabeth Baer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.	In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

598

Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited, Appellant, vs. Clark-Montana Realty Company, and Elm Orlu Mining Company.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Ap- peals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is affirmed with costs; and that the [illegible] hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

62 J. S. Nicholas & Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.

63 Alex. W. Shaw & Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.

On writs of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

These cases came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged

that the judgment of the United States Court of Customs Appeals in these causes be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

The Mechanics and Metals National Bank of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Henry H. Seldomridge, as Receiver of the Mercantile National Bank of Pueblo, Colorado.

175

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, in this cause be, and the same are hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with instructions that after setting aside its judgment of be in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

- Orig. 16 In the matter of
Albert Hirschel
de Prosper.

Per curiam.

Coming to consider the answer to the rule to show cause why the order of January 7, 1918, admitting Albert Hirschel de Prosper to be a member of the bar of this Court should not be set aside because of the failure to disclose material facts which would have prevented the granting of said order had they been known to the Court, and moreover directing its attention to the report of the committee of the bar appointed by the Court to consider the subject.

The Court finds both from the answer to the rule to show cause and the report of the committee that the said order of admission, because of the non-communication by the applicant of facts which if known would have prevented the allowance of the order, was wrongfully granted.

It is, therefore, now adjudged that the said order of admission be vacated, that the ment from the rolls; and that the certificate evidencing such enrollment be and the same is hereby cancelled.

The Court expresses its grateful acknowledgement to the committee of the bar for the alacrity with which they responded to the request to take charge of the subject-matter of the rule which has been disposed of by the order just stated, and for the promptness, intelligence and efficiency with which they discharged their duty.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

206 L. C. Watson, as Trustee
in Bankruptcy of
Duncan & Company,
D. P. Duncan and K. A.
Duncan, Bankrupts,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George W. Motley.

In error to
the Supreme
Court of the
State of
Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be

the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

223

Alfred H. Church,
Appellant,
vs.
Horace M. Sutherland,
The Commercial Trust
Company of New York
City, and John S. Shep
pard, Jr., as Receiver and
Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Wyckoff, Church &
Partridge, Inc.

Appeal from
the United States
Circuit Court
of Appeals for
the Second
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States ex
rel. George W. Bittmann,
Appellant,

326

Matthew J. Long, Criminal Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

419. R. A. Flanders, as Trustee, etc.,
Appellant,
vs.
E. J. Coleman.

On consideration of the motion to place this case on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 3rd, 1919, continued.

600 Frank M. Darling, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Newport News.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 14th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

731 Louis W. Hill, administrator of the Estate of James J. Hill deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Newton A. K. Bugbee, Comptroller of the Treasury of the State of New Jersey, and William T. Read, State Treasurer.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument after case No. 245.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

779 (Oneida) Navigation Corporation, claimant of the Sailing Vessel "Percy R. Pyne 2nd", etc.

W. & S. Job & Company, Inc. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause for oral argument, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, but the case will be taken on printed briefs if counsel are so advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

784 The Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner vs. O. W. Seay. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

798 Kate Richards O'Hare, Petitioner, vs. The United States of On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit

5339

for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

801 Fox Typewriter Company, Petitioner,
vs
August J. Ohring and Pratt & Whitney Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Norfolk Southern Rail-road Company, Petitioner vs. Harvey King.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

84

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Petitioner vs. George C. Brisco	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

121

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

658

Ed C. Lasater,
Petitioner,
vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company, First State Bank of Corpus Christi, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

812

Atlanta National Bank,
Petitioner
vs.
William A. Fuller, Trustee in Bankruptcy for Phoenix Planing Mill, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

817. James Kenney, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

826. F. B. Glasscock and the Denning Investment Company, Petitioners, vs. Ellie McDaniel et al., minors, by J. O. Bowens, Guardian.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a

of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

830

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
New Jersey Fidelity & Plate Glass Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig.

Ex parte: In the matter of the United States,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition and or a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, March 3rd, 1919, continued.

Solicitor General King on behalf of the Attorney General of the United States.

563 Lake E. Parker et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Eastman Richard and R. M. Martin Company, administrators, &c.

The motion to advance this cause to be heard with No. 313 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellants.

186 William N. Odell,
Appellant,
vs.
D. C. Farnsworth Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Edmund H. [illegible] in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to withdraw his appearance heretofore entered in this cause.

439 William T. Richardson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Liberty Oil Company et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Harry Gamble for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. E. J. Jacquet for the plaint-

5341

Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Rail road Company,
Petitioner,
1172 vs.
Alfred H. Smith.

The motion to affirm or place on the summary docket in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. Alan Goldsborough for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman,
Plaintiffs in Error,
865 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Weinberger for the plaintiffs in error.

José de Guzman et al.,
Petitioners,
no — vs.
Faustino Lichauco.

The motion to extend time in which to file and submit petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by for the petitioners.

818 Annie B. Foster suing for herself and surviving children of A. B. Foster, deceased, Petitioner vs. J. J. Lancaster and Charles Wright, receivers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Winter for the petitioner and by Mr. George Thompson for the respondent.

829 J. B. Weeks et al., Petitioners vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. H. Winter in behalf of Mr. George E. Wallace for the petitioners and by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. J. W. Terry and Mr. A. H. Culwell for the respondents.

The American Railroad Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner

The People of Porto Rico. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. W. McKenney in behalf of Mr. Francis H. Dexter for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward S. Bailey and Mr. Howard L. Kern for the respondents.

863 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Kittanning Iron & Steel Manufacturing Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Henry Wolf Biklé for the petitioner.

185 William Kinzell, Petitioner vs. Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway. The motion to place this cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Gray for the petitioner in support of the motion and by Mr. Herman H. Field and Mr. George W. Korte for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Monday, March 3rd 1919, continued.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Petitioner, vs. The Liquid Carbonic Company. Sub'd

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry C. Attwill, and Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles A. Snow and Mr. William P. Everts for the respondent.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of John P. Weitz, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of the petitioner.

Mackay Telegraph and Cable Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Little Rock. Sub'd

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James H. Mahaffy, for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. J. C. Marshall for the plain-

606 H. A. Justis and A. B. McMullen, plaintiffs in error, vs. Elias Davis et al. The motion to dismiss or affirm or place on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Bernard S. Rodey for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. [illegible] H. Clements, and Mr. Alonzo B. McMullen for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

482 Dorsey Land and Lumber Company vs. Board of Directors of Garland Levee District. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Wherefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Monday, March 3rd 1919, continued.

834 W. B. Buskirk and G. M. Craft, as partners composing Kentucky River Hardwood Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Isham Caudill, as Administrator of the estate of Joseph Caudill, deceased.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

417 W. E. McKinley et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Robert Douglas Feagin for the plaintiffs in error and

and Mr. W. C. [illegible] for the defendant in error.

599 Minerals Separation Limited et al., Petitioners, vs. Butte & Superior Mining Company.

On motion of Mr. F. D. McKenney, it is ordered that this cause be passed on account of the sickness of counsel.

543 Victor M. Freeman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. M. Pendleton Jr., for the petitioner.

523 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. J. F. McBride.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee for the petitioner and by Mr. Thomas M. Seawell and Mr. Frank Pace for the respondent.

Monday, March 3rd 1919 continued.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner
824 vs
J. B. Allen et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Douglas Brookman for the petitioner and by Mr. Hugh L. Dickson for the respondents.

Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railway Company, Petitioner
825 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William D. McKenzie for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Joseph W. P. Keefe, trustee, &c. Petitioner
827 vs
Marcus Ward Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Arthur R. Johnson for the petitioner and by Mr. Edmund K. Arents

831

Canadian Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Gust Eggen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. William D. Mitchell and Mr. Pierce Butler for the petitioner and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.)

836

John Rudolphi, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Alexander S. Drescher for the petitioner.

837

The Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. William Sheridan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward Colston and Mr. George Hoadly for the petitioner and by Mr. J. H. Frantz and Mr. Charles M. Seymour for the respondent.)

2 George R. Broadwell, Petitioner, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Creek County, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Charles L. Moore and Mr. George C. Stoner for the petitioner.

857 W. E. Kirchner, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. William Beard and Mr. J. W. Vandervort for the petitioner and Mr. John Lord O'Brian and Mr. Alfred Bettman for the respondent.

858 The City of New York Petitioner vs. Arthur Crosby Hume, as receiver &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William P. Burr for the petitioner and by Mr. Joseph A. Kellogg, for the respondent.

859 L. P. Larson, Jr. Company, Petitioner, vs. Mint Products Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. George I. Haight, Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. Frank F. Reed for the petitioner and by Mr. James R. Offield for the respondent.

861 Charles K. Duncan, as Trustee &c., Petitioner vs. The American Trust and Savings Bank. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Claude W. Ritter for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry Johnston for the respondent.

862 David J. Kreuzer, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Stephens Barclay for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the

881 The St. Charles
Amusement & Dance
Pavilion Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Sidney B. Eckhardt
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Louis C. Bryden for the petitioner and by Mr. T. A. Wright and Mr. Will D. Wright for the respondents.

885 Samuel Bernstein,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Robert H. Talley for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

573 Supreme Conclave,
Improved Order of
Heptasophs,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Marshall Wilson.

This cause was argued by Mr. George R. Allen for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Thaddeus A. Adams for the defendants in error.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of Mississippi.

7 Orig'l

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Herbert Pope for the complainant and by Mr. Garner W. Green for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 4th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court was opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Allan Davis, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, and Clifton Williams, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ambrose Kennedy

Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that John Alden Purinton, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser, it is ordered that Timothy Healy, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that William Gordon, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Georgia,

—Orig. Complainant,

vs.

The State of South Carolina. The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Peeples and Mr. Clifford Walker for the complainant.

7 Orig. The State of Arkansas, Complainant, vs. The State of Mississippi. The argument of this cause concluded by Mr. Garner W. Green for the defendant.

71 Rust Land & Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ed. Jackson et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Albert M. Kales for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Garner W. Green for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Herbert Pope for the plaintiff in error.

10 Orig. The State of South Dakota, Complainant, vs. Charles B. Collins. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed

by Mr. Edward E. Wagner for the said plainant. No appearance for the defendant.

571

The United States of America, Petitioner,
vs.
Suda Reynolds.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Petitioner and continued by Mr. Mack Goode for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court was adjourned until Tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 5th 1919, continued.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal;
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Montague, it is ordered that Earl H. Beshlin, Esquire, of Warren, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph B. Thompson, it is ordered that John M. Taylor, Esquire, of Claremore, State of Okla-attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman Hatty, it is ordered that Richard A. Billups, Esquire, of Cordell, State of Oklahoma, and Victor W. Sprague, Esquire, of Cheboygan, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Horigan, it is ordered that Louis E. Giles, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael J. Phelan, it is ordered that James E. O'Connell, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Lynes, it is ordered that Charles B. Henderson, Esquire, of Elko, State of Nevada

Bonnell, Esquire, of San Bernardino State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser, it is ordered that George L. Pospert, Esquire, of Sacramento State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Crawford Biggs, it is ordered that Fulton A. Crouch, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

101.

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
John Newman

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William F. Herrin, Mr. Henry T. Gage, Mr. William J. Gilbert, Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Frank

208 The State of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mono County Irrigation Company. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. S. Webb for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

209 The State of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Pacific Power Company. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. S. Webb for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

591 The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Sudas Reynolds. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Mark Loader for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Hoyt for the Petitioner.

585 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Southern Pacific Company. Four and one half hours allowed for the argument

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful in that behalf. Argument commenced by Mr. J. Crawford Biggs for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Charles H. Reeves for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 6th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Dawson, it is ordered that Robert E. Cunningham, Esquire, of Great Falls, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard J. Quigley, it is ordered that Charles Greshfeld, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

585 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Southern Pacific Company et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the appellant and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the appellant.

682 Bessie Tyrrell &c., Petitioner, vs. Charles B. Shaffer et al. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry B. Martin and Mr. Richard Clyde Allen for the petitioners and by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser for the respondents.

549 Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, Petitioners vs. John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue &c. — This cause was argued by Mr. Felix Rackemann for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

141. The United States ex rel. William H. Dean, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. Prescott Gatley for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 7th 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. S. Kenyon, it is ordered that Frank Wisdom, Esquire, of Bedford, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene it is ordered that Herbert P. Whitney, Esquire of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice

5349

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Roberts it is ordered That Frank N. Nay, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, it is ordered Tom Scofield Patterson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Ayers it is ordered that William B. Walton, Esquire, of Silver City, and Edward D. Tittmann, Esquire, of Hillsboro, State of New Mexico be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. C. Hilliard, it is ordered that Robert Crosser, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

41 The United States ex rel. William F. Arant, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley for the plaintiff in error and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the defendant in error.

815 The Commercial Cable Company, Appellant, vs. Albert S. Burleson et als., and

816 Commercial Pacific Cable Company, Appellant, vs. Albert S. Burleson et als.

Two hours allowed each side for the argument of these cases on motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes in that behalf. Argument commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants, continued by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 10th 1919.—

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court sat as follows.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Cortlandt A. Johnson, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Hanley, it is ordered that H. J. [illegible], Esquire, and John J. [illegible], Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes it is ordered that Mason Trowbridge, Esquire, and Stanley K. Henn, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered that T. C. Dougherty, Esquire, of Thurber, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lloyd Hughes it is ordered that John W. Oast Jr., Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges it is ordered that Orson M. Layman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

it is ordered that Henry R. Scott, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Graham Foster, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg it is ordered that Wilbur H. Clare, Esquire, of Webster Groves, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing N. Scott, it is ordered that Howard L. Bevans, Esquire, and Nathan Isaacs, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that [illegible] of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

32.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company and Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioners,	On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.
vs.	
J. G. Leach.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Pitney and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Clarke.

685

Jacob Frohwerk,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

714

Eugene V. Debs,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the

Monday, March 10th 1919, continued.

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

101 Southern Pacific Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Newman. | In error to the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

208 The State of California, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mono County Irrigation Company of California. | In error to the District Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District of the State of California.

the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

209

The State of California, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Pacific Power Company.

In error to the District Court of Appeals for the Third Appellate District of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

06 H. W. Justice and R. B. McMillen,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Elena Romero, Vicente Romero, and Elias Romero & Son.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

82 Bessie Pyeatt nee Offutt, C. B. Pyeatt and John O. Mitchell,
Petitioners,
vs.
Charles B. Shaffer and W. J. Rowland.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Su

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

375

Charles B. Shaffer, Appellant, vs. E. B. Howard, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, and John S. Woofter, Sheriff of Creek County, State of Oklahoma.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill for want of

Monday, March 10th 1919 continued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The People of the State of New York,

Complainant,

30 Orig.

vs.

The State of New Jersey and Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners.

In Equity.

[illegible]

[illegible] three sanitary or [illegible], concerning the [illegible]

(1) [illegible] of [illegible] of [illegible] Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners, [illegible] ion, and the nature [illegible] appliances that may be [illegible] order to lessen the alleged [illegible] of New York Harbor;

[illegible] osal or treatment capable [illegible] City of New York and the [illegible] alleged polluting [illegible] New York Harbor.

[illegible]

[illegible] as stated [illegible] any [illegible] subject matter [illegible] before the fifteenth day of [illegible]

[illegible] to take the testi[illegible] experts as [illegible] as they [illegible] paragraph 3, [illegible] on or [illegible]

[illegible] recall [illegible] have been [illegible] and may [illegible] matter of [illegible] on or [illegible]

[illegible]

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Origl

Ex parte: In the matter of the United States of America, Owner of the American Steamship, "Lake Monroe," Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and a writ of mandamus

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Origl

Ex parte: In the matter of the United States of America, Owner of the American Steamship, "Lake Monroe." Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition filed herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the Honorable James M. Morton, Jr., Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts and the officers of said Court, before this Court, at the City of Washington on Monday, April 14th 1919, at 12 o'clock noon of can be heard, why a writ of prohibition should not issue as prayed in said petition.

It is further ordered that cause be shown at the same place and time by the Honorable James M. Morton, Jr., Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, why a writ of mandamus should not issue as prayed in said petition.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Origl. Ex parte: In the matter of John P. Waitz, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Origl. The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same writ against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

José Guzman et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Faustino Lichauco.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time in which to print and file the record in support of the petition for a writ of certiorari previously presented herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the time extended until the receipt of the printed transcript of the record in the case.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

563

Gabe E. Parker, Gabe E. Parker as Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Eastman Richard and R. W. Martin, Co-administrators of the Estate of Samuel Richards, deceased.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with case No. 313

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief

865 Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.

On considera-tion of the motion to ad-vance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 14th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

39 William P. Richardson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Liberty Oil Company, et al.

On considera-tion of the mo-tion to dismiss herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

85 William Kinzell, Petitioner, vs. Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway.

On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket. It is now here ordered by the Court hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1172

Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Alfred H. Smith.

On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

831

Canadian Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Gus Eggen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

842 George R. Bracewell, Petitioner vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Custer County, Oklahoma. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per the Chief Justice White.

857 H. E. Kirchner, Petitioner vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

863 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Pittsburg Iron & Steel Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

543 Gideon M. Freeman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this

same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Railroad Company of Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thomas B. Foster, suing for himself and surviving children of A. G. Foster, deceased,
Petitioners,
818 vs.
J. L. Lancaster and Pearl Wight, receivers for the Texas &

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner
823 vs.
J. F. McBride.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner
824 vs.
J. C. Allen et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railway Company, Petitioner,	On petition for writ of certiorari
825 vs.	to the United States Circuit
The United States of America.	Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Joseph P. Keefe, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Russell Falls Company,

827

vs.
Worcester Trust Company

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

829

J. F. Weeks et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Pe-

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

836

John Rudolph,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States
of America.

On Petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the
Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

839

The Cincinnati, New
Orleans & Texas Pa-
cific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
William Sheridan.

On Petition for
writ of certi-
orari to the Su-
preme Court of
the State of
Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same,

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

844

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Petitioner
vs.
Liquid Carbonic Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

858

The City of New York,
Petitioner,
vs.
Arthur Carter Hume, as Receiver of the South Shore Traction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

L. P. Larson, Jr., Company,
Petitioner
859 vs.
Mint Products Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles K. Newman, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of George E. Lum,
Petitioner
861 vs.
American Trust and Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

882

David J. Kreuzer,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America.

On Petition for writ
of certiorari to the
United States Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

884

The St. Charles Amusement & Transportation
Company,
Petitioner
vs.

On Petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit
Court of Appeals

Prieck.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

885 Samuel Bernstein, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Besight Company and Benjamin Maufer,

12 Petitioners

Monday, March 10th 1919, continued.

One-Piece Bifocal Lens Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward Rector and Mr. F. H. Lockwood for the respondent.

901 Oliver R. Gillespie and Martha Morgan, Petitioners, vs. E. W. Scott, trustee of the Bankrupt estate of Oliver R. Gillespie, bankrupt. The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Francis E. Lindquist for the petitioners.

— Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Wilfred A. Tompkins, Petitioner. The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis E. Lindquist for the petitioner.

Iowa Central Railway

546 Petitioner vs. J. W. Barnes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. F. Finerty, in behalf of Mr. C. H. E. Boardman for the petitioner and by Mr. Milton Remley for the respondent.

880 New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Company, Petitioner vs. Lottie Wilkins, Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Floyd Hughes and Mr. Thomas H. Willcox for the petitioner and by Mr. John W. Oast, Jr., for the respondent.

866 Zenith Carburetor Company, Petitioner vs. Stromberg Motor Devices Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Melville W. Church in behalf of Mr. Clarence P. Byrnes and Mr. Melville Church for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles A. Brown for the respondent.

— Orig.

The State of Kansas,
Complainant,
vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Post-
master General, etc., et al.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. E. [illegible] for the complainant.

80

James A. Cochnower,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The motion to amend the judgment herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Michener and Mr. William E. Russell for the appellant in support of the motion.

418

The City of Chicago et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Thomas E. Dempsey, as
chairman, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss as to certain plaintiffs in error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Gurley, Mr. Harry P. Weber and Mr. George W. Miller for Chicago City Railway Company, Chicago Railways Company, Calumet & South Chicago Railway Company four of the plaintiffs in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Chester E. Cleveland for the City of Chicago, one of the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

819

Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company and Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioners
vs
Des Moines Union Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. L. Minnis, Mr. J. Burton Hanson and Mr. John C. Cook for the petitioners and by Mr. H. M. Lehmann for the respondents.

820

Des Moines Union Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company and Wabash Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. M. Lehmann for the petitioners and by Mr. John C. Cook, Mr. Burton Hanson and Mr. James

860.

Fidelity Title & Trust
Company, ancillary
administrator, &c.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Dubois Electric Com-
pany.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., for the Petitioner.

862.

The Automoline Com-
pany,
Petitioner,
vs.
Julius Strohmeyer
trading as Julius Stro-
meyer & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Chester N. Rowe, Jr., for the Petitioner and by Mr. Michael J. Ryan for the respondent.

872

H. M. Luck, Executrix,
etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Abram P. Staples, Trustee,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. L. Welborn for the Pe the respondent.

587 Stephen H. Pell, et al., Petitioners, vs. W. Gordon McCabe Jr., and William P. Daly.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Emanuel J. Myers, Mr. Gordon S. P. Kleeberg and Mr. Hinckley M. Garrison for the petitioners and by Mr. Henry Buist and Mr. William St. John Tozer for the respondents.

841 St. Louis Southwestern Railway of Texas, Petitioner, vs. Frank Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of Mr. E. B. Perkins for the petitioner.

876 Amy Haney et al., Petitioners, vs. Albert Anderson et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser for the petitioners.

Monday, March 10th 1919, continued.

903 Frederick H. Clarke and Henry P. Clarke, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George Haldeman for the petitioners.

828 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Colgate and Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the defendant.

168 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Purcell-Envelope Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellant and by Mr. Arthur Black for the appellee.

213 Jennie Lathrop Rand, Appellant, vs.

The death of Jennie Lathrop Rand, the appellant, gestion and the appearance of Henry L. Rand and Edmund L. Rand, executors of the estate of Jennie Lathrop Rand, deceased, filed and entered on motion of Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellant.

Henry L. Rand, and Edmund L. Rand Executors of the estate of Jennie Lathrop Rand deceased,
Appellants,
213 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 11th 1919 continued.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Lakin Brown it is ordered that Jo Johnson, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Myers, it is ordered that Edward W. Norman, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland be admitted to the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mayden K. Bryant, it is ordered that Percy S. Webster, Esquire, of Stockton, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

178 Dominion Hotel, Inc.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Arizona.

This cause was submitted to consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry M. Friend for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Wiley E. Jones for the defendant in error.

222 Takao Ozawa,
vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the United States, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

Henry L. Rand and
Edward L. Rand, Executors of the estate of
James Lathrop Rand

213 Appellants, vs. The United States. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee.

214 Henry A. Wise, Trustee, etc., Appellant, vs. The United States. This cause was argued by Mr. William B. King for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee.

215 Skinner & Eddy Corporation, Appellant, vs. The United States of America et al. On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson three counsel were allowed to make oral argument for the appellees and one half hour additional time was allowed each side for oral argument. Argument commenced by Mr. Joseph N. Teal for the appellant continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the United States, by Mr. Albert L. Hoffheimer for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. John F. Finerty for the railroad companies

Tuesday, March 11th 1919, continued.

for the appellant.

201 The United States, Appellant,
vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 12th 1919. - -

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Lockwood, it is ordered that William M. Parke, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Ford O'Brien it is ordered that Louis L. [illegible], Esquire, of Jamestown, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of

Wednesday, March 12th 1919, continued.

201 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellant, by Mr. Alexander Britton for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellant.

216 Isabel Kouns O'Rey, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. George A. King for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee.

217 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant, vs. Joseph J. Darlington et al., Trustees, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the appellant and by Mr. Francis W. Clements for the appellee.

St. Louis Poster Advertising Company,

220	vs. The City of St. Louis et al., and The St. Louis Poster Advertising Company, Appellant, vs. City of St. Louis et al.	The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Mason C. Cooley for the plaintiff in error and appellant.
2		

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 13th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke

Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon it is ordered that Shepard J. Crumpacker, Esquire of South Bend, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Kirby, it is ordered that Walter M. Purvis, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas be admitted of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard L. Bevis, it is ordered that Harry Bronwirth, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Miller Kenyon, it is ordered that Harry H. Schutte, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert C. Smyth, it is ordered that Edward Endicott Griffin, Esquire, of Albany and Mr. Frederick H. Bigood, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett it is ordered that Harry W. Reynolds, Esquire, of

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hannis Taylor, it is ordered that David Ezekiel Henderson, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph N. Teal, it is ordered that Rogers MacVeagh, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Douglas Park Jockey Club, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. N. Talbott et al., composing Kentucky State Racing Commission.	In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

152

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

238

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Arizona.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. W. Clurbrow, Mr. Henley C. Booth, and Mr. William F. Herron for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Wiley E. Jones for the defendant in error.

220

St. Louis Poster Advertising Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of St. Louis et al.
and

2

The St. Louis Poster Advertising Company,
Appellant,
vs.
City of St. Louis et al.

The argument of these causes was continued by Marion C. Early for the plaintiff in error and appellant and concluded by Mr. Everett Paul Griffin for the defendants in error and appellees.

Thursday, March 13th 1919, continued.

224 Lake Erie & Western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois ex rel. J. S. Cummins. — This cause was argued by Mr. C. S. Schneider for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. George B. Gillespie for the plaintiff in error.

225 Mrs. M. E. Sims et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. H. Steel, et al. — This cause was argued by Mr. G. B. Dougherty for the plaintiffs in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

226 The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Stephen Manoloff. — This cause was argued by Mr. Albert H. Miller for the defendant in error and submitted by Mr. Alexander L. Smith for the plaintiff in error.

227 Ball Engineering Company, Petitioner, vs. J. G. White & Com

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William M. Parker for the petitioner continued by Mr. Harry W. Reynolds and Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Charles W. Lockwood for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court was adjourned until Tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 17th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer S. Laurel, it is ordered that Sherman A. Hill, Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. S. Custis it is ordered that Ralph F. Potter, Esquire

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. R. Ogilby it is ordered that Robert H. Neilson, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that William M. Toomer, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Oreste da Vella, Royal Italian Consul, as administrator &c.

239.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Elery M. Black and Mr. William W. Prentice for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. J. W. Sanborn for the defendant

Friday, March 14th 1919 continued.

213 J. Eugene Jordan, plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Medical Examiners of the State of Washington.

This cause was continued until the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

228 Standard Computing Scale Company, Limited, Appellant, vs. John A. Farrell as State Superintendent of Weights & Measures &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. N.C. Smyth for the appellant and by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the appellee.

230 The Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Appellant, and Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Manila Electric Rail and Light Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the appellant and plaintiff in error and by Mr. Robert A. Neilson for the appellee and defendant in error.

231 Capital Transportation Company, Petitioner vs.

Friday, March 14th 1919. continued.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Parker Kirlin for the Petitioner and continued by Mr. Francis S. Laws for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 17th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lunsford L. Hammer, it is ordered that Charles A. Hammer, Esquire of Harrisonburg, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, it is ordered that Edward C. Stevens, Esquire of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Ralph B. Evans, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. (1)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Frank E. Harkness, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Edgar Britt, it is ordered that Thomas H. Sheridan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. (7)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. D. Norton it is ordered that Edward W. Burke, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. T. Brickman it is ordered that Abram B. Stratton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty, it is ordered that Walter William Burns, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grafton L. McGill, it is ordered that Francis S. Maguire, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer it is ordered that Louis H. Warner, Esquire of Northampton, State of Massachusetts

counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund A. Patton, It is ordered that George J. Pendleton, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

169.

The Postal Telegraph-Cable Company, Appellant,
vs.
City of Richmond

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Clarke.)

Gratiot County State

48

vs.

Lloyd Johnson, as Trustee of the St. Louis Chemical Company, Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al., Appellants,

277 vs.

John M. Landon, as Receiver of the Kansas Natural Gas Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Kansas City, Missouri;
The Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri, et al.,
Appellants,
324 vs.
John M. Landon, Receiver of the Kansas Natural Gas Company, et al.

Kansas City Gas Company, The Wyandotte County Gas Company et al.

Monday, March 17th, 1919, continued.

330 vs.
Kansas Natural Gas
Company, John M.
Landon and George
W. Smith, Receivers,
and Fidelity Title and
Trust Company.
vs.
The Public Utility Com-
mission of the State of
Kansas et al.
Appellants,
353 vs.
John M. Landon as Re-
ceiver of the Kansas Na-
tural Gas Company et al.

Appeals from
the District Court
of the United
States for the
District of
Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas on separate appeals, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

649 Alvah Crocker et al. Trustees, Petitioners,
vs.
John F. Malley, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs,* and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

* and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Massachusetts;

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,

In Equity.

Charles B. Collins. This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings and proofs and the report of the Referee filed herein, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the report of the Referee herein be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

And it is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the said complainant recover of the said defendant the sum of $32,094.27 with interest thereon at the rate of 7% per annum from January 1st 1907 and the costs and disbursements of this suit.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The City of Chicago, Chicago City Railway Company, Chicago Railways Company, Calumet & South Chicago Railway Company, and the Southern Street Railway Company, Plaintiffs in Error,

148 vs.

Thomas E. Kemey, as Chairman and Frank H. Funk et al., individually and as members of

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the motion of the Chicago City Railway Company, Chicago Railways Company, Calumet & South Chicago Railway Company, and the Southern Street Railways Company, for leave to withdraw as plaintiffs in error in said case and to discontinue the writ of error as to them, and was submitted by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, as to the said Chicago City Railway Company, Chicago Railways Company, Calumet & South Chicago Railway Company, and the Southern Street Railway Company be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs, upon the condition that the exercise of permission to withdraw shall be a consent to a severance and without prejudice to the right of the City of Chicago to prosecute its writ of error to a final conclusion.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

373

Supreme Conclave
Improved Order of
Heptasophs,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
William Marshall Wilson.

In error to the
Supreme
Court of the
State of North
Carolina.

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Stephen Manoloff.	In error to the Court of Appeals of the Sixth Appellate District of the State of Ohio

226

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the Sixth Appellate District of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

The Denver & Rio
Grande Railroad

Monday, March 19th 1917 continued.

239

Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Oreste da Vella, Royal Italian Consul, as Administrator of the estate of Vincenzo Piastero, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

225

Mrs. M. E. Sims et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
W. H. Stark et al.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now

that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of Wilfred Tompkins, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice.

Orig. The State of Kansas, Complainant, vs. Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on the first day of the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, and The

Monday, March 5th 1917 continued

Petitioner
819
vs.
Des Moines Union
Railway Company
& J. M. Hubbell et al.

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Des Moines Union
Railway Company
& J. M. Hubbell et al.,
Petitioners
820
vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee
& St. Paul Railway Company and Wabash
Railway Company.

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the
United States
Circuit Court
of Appeals
for the Eighth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

argument thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Stephen H. P. Pell,
Charles Whittle, Howland H. Pell and Robert M. Thompson,
Petitioners

889 vs.

W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., and William F. Gray.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Iowa Central Railway Company,
Petitioner

846 vs.

J. W. Brown.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Nulomoline Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Julius Strohmeyer, trading as Julius Strohmeyer & Company.

862

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Zenith Carburetor Company, Petitioner,
vs.

866

On petition for writ of certiorari to

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

872

Wm. Luck, Executor of Wm. M. E. Luck, Estate, Petitioner

vs.

Abram P. Staples, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the estate of the Luck Construction Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Company, Petitioner,

880 vs.

Lillie Withers, Administratrix of the Estate of Alexander Withers, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St Louis Southwestern Railway of Texas, Petitioner,

891 vs.

Frank Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States

Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Bright Company and Benjamin Mayer, Petitioners,	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.
872 vs.	
One-piece Bifocal Lens Company.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Anna Harney, Lydia Chubbee, Annie Wise et al., Petitioners,	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.
876 vs.	
Albert Anderson, Henry Burnett, et al.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

903

Frederick H. Clarke and Henry P. Clarke, Petitioners.
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

904

Oliver R. Gillespie and Martha Morgan, Petitioners.
vs.
E. W. Scott, Trustee, etc.

Oliver R. Gillespie,
Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

874 Edward A. Rumely,
Appellant,
vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy,
U.S. Marshal, &c.,
et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, for the appellee.

881 The United States of America,
Appellant,
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant.

1131 The Brainerd, Shales & Hall Quarry Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Wilson B. Brice, as sole surviving executor &c.

This cause was advanced under the 32d Rule on motion of Mr. E. W. Worcester for the plaintiff in error and case submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. W. Worcester for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Bronson Winthrop for the defendant in error.

759 Alex. J. Groesbeck et al., Appellants, vs. Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Dacey for the appellee.

1192. Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ben Avon Borough et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Watson Smith for the plain

708 The United States, Appellant, vs. Cornelius S. Babcock.

The motion to transfer this cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King and Mr. William E. Harvey for the appellee.

915 The United States, Appellant, vs. Herbert B. Hayden.

The motion to transfer this cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King and Mr. William E. Harvey for the appellee.

854 Daly-West Mining Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Catherine Savage et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William H. King and Mr. Hiram E. Booth for the petitioners.

Orig. Ex parte In the matter of Christoffer Hannevig and Richmond Johnson

The motion for leave to file petitions for tition, (mandamus or certiorari) was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun in behalf of Mr. Andrew R. Crudens and Mr. Howard Mayer Kingsbury for the Petitioners.

911
Mark Eisner as Collector of United States Internal Revenue, &c.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Myrtle H. Macomber.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed argument by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error.

873
Edward E. Gold, &c. Gold Car Heating and Lighting Company,
Petitioners
vs.
James T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

On motion of Mr. Langdon L. McGill in their behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

250
John E. Rollins,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
O. B. Cooley.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his writ of error, and failing to appear it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court, and on motion of Mr. C. A. Hammer of counsel for the defendant in error, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals to be proceeded in, according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

C. C. Calhoun,
Petitioner,
869 vs.
Edward Massie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John D. Brooks in behalf of Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the petitioner.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
852 vs.
Hugh Petit and Newburger Cotton Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

Mr. W. O'B. Cooper for the petitioner and by Mr. Julian C. Wilson and Mr. Walter P. Armstrong for the respondent.

853

North American Telegraph Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Royal A. Stone, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Edward M. Young and Mr. Alexander E. Horn, for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the respondent.

867

Troy Mason,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. P. Brown for the petitioner.

873

Edward E. Gold, and Gold Car Heating & Lighting Company,
Petitioners
vs.
James P. Newton Company-

The petitions for a writ of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the by Mr. William A. Kinsley and Mr. Arthur L. Duncan for the petitioner.

875 Arthur L. Blunt, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles F. Caruso for the petitioner.

883 J. B. Gray, Petitioner, vs. Bank of Hartford and Claude Thompson, Sheriff of Sebastian County. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph M. Hill and Mr. Henry L. Fitzhugh for the petitioner and by Mr. Webb Covington for the respondents.

887 Wilhelm Knauth et al., Petitioners, vs. John W. Knight et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George P. Hoag, for the petitioners and by Mr. Augustin

890 Henry A. House, Petitioner vs. Lawrence M. Lubben. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. P. Goepel, Mr. J. J. Darlington and Mr. J. W. Cullinan for the petitioner and by Mr. Joseph A. Milans for the respondent.

877 James A. Bishop, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners vs. Great Lakes Towing Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harry W. Standidge for the petitioners and by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder, Mr. Thomas H. Garry and Mr. Ralph P. Potter for the respondent.

878 North British & Mercantile Insurance Company, Petitioner vs. A. Baars & Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. [illegible] and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner

Whitman for the respondent.

707 Otto Vogel Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Autopiano Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William F. Hall, for the petitioner.

231 Capital Transportation Company, Petitioner, vs. Cambria Steel Company.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Francis S. Laws for the respondent.

7 Orig. Ex parte In the matter of W. A. Wagner, &c., Petitioner.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Rowe Lewis for the respondents and concluded by Mr. H. A. Toulmin for the petitioner.

15 Citizens Bank of Michigan City, Indiana, Plaintiff in Error, vs.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. B. Collins for the and by Mr. S. J. Crumpacker for the defendant in error.

210 John W. Paxton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Civil Township of Lallie, Benson County, North Dakota. | The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. E. Ellsworth, for the Plaintiff in Error.

Q 717

373 Supreme Conclave, Improved Order of Heptasophs, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Marshall Watson | On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 18th, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met to day at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter   Associate
Mahlon Pitney   Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Shepard Barclay it is ordered that Andrew B. Remick, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Guy it is ordered that Andrew A. Bennett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be

counsellor of this court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend it is ordered that Herbert J. Rushton, Esquire, of Escanaba, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

252
The Seattle Electric Company, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The City of Seattle et al.

This cause was continued on stipulation of counsel.

253
The Board of Public Utility Commissioners,
Appellant & Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Compañia General de Tabacos de Filipinas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the appellant and plaintiff in error and by Mr. F. C. Fisher for the appellee and defendant in error.

John W. Davis

240 vs.
Civil Township of Lallie,
Benson County, North
Dakota.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. E. J. Burke for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. S. E. Ellsworth for the plaintiffs in error.

241 Loretta Dilliston,
Petitioner
vs.
Albion Vein Slate
Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Calvin R. Smith for the petitioner and by Mr. Ralph B. Evans for the respondent.

242 New Orleans & North
eastern Railroad Com-
pany et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Joe Scarlet.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the plaintiffs in error and submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Dewell for the defendant in error.

243. Lawrence Maxwell et al.,
Executors &c.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Newton A. K. Bugbee,
Comptroller &c. et al.

trator &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Newton A. K. Bugbee,
Comptroller of the State
of New Jersey, et al.

731 The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. John R. Hardin for the defendants in error, and by Mr. E. C. Lindley for the plaintiff in error in No. 734.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 19th, 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is [illegible] that A. Mitchell Palmer, Esquire, of Stroudsburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Solicitor General King presented Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer of Pennsylvania, as Attorney General of the United States be recorded. The said commission is in the following words:

"Woodrow Wilson
President of the United States of America
To all who shall see these presents, Greeting:

Know ye that reposing special trust and confidence in the Patriotism, Integrity and Abilities of A. Mitchell Palmer, of Pennsylvania, I do appoint him Attorney General and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that office according to law and to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto him the said A. Mitchell Palmer, during the pleasure of the President of the United States for the time being, and until the end of the next session of the Senate of the United States and no longer.

In testimony whereof I have caused these Letters to be made Patent and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand at the City of Washington, the fifth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

SEAL

Woodrow Wilson.

By the President
Frank L. Polk,
Acting Secretary of State.

572 Northern Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. R. Thompson, as County Treasurer of Flathead County, Montana.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

Lawrence Maxwell et al.,
Executrix &c.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
245 vs.

Wednesday, March 17th 1919, continued

troller &c., et al.,
and
Louis N. Hill, Administrator &c.,
Plaintiff in Error
731
vs.
Newton A. K. Bugbee, Comptroller &c., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. E. C. Lindley for the Plaintiff in error in No 731.

James J. Brougham and Arthur N. Stanley
Appellants
247
vs.
Blanton Manufacturing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the appellant and by Mr. Shepard Barclay for the appellee.

Texas & Pacific Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners
249
vs.
B. Leatherwood.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. George Thompson and Mr. J. H. Barwise Jr., for the Petitioners and by Mr. W. J. Beeman for the respondent.

Fred A. Carley et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error

The State of North Carolina. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Julius C. Martin, Mr. Thomas S. Rollins and Mr. George H. Wright for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. James S. Manning and Mr. R. H. Sykes for the defendant in error.

251 Gabe E. Parker as Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes et al., Appellants, vs. Dootie Riley a minor by W. C. Stockton, her guardian, et al. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the appellants. No appearance for the appellee.

597 Minerals Separation et al., Petitioners vs. Butte & Superior Mining Company. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry D. Williams for the petitioners

continued by Mr. J. Edgar Bull for the

Houston Kenyon for the petitioner.

255	J. E. Hathaway & Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King for the Appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court was adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Thursday, March 20th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice;
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. McKenney it is ordered that Alfred A. Cook, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Bryan, it is ordered that Albert H. Conner, Esquire, of Sandpoint, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg it is ordered that John O. P. Wheelwright, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Charles R. Hollingsworth, Esquire, of Ogden, State of Utah be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

259	Hiram B. Hines et al., Trustees etc., et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.	On motion of Mr. William M. Hargest for the defendant in error it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby

passed pursuant to section 9, Rule 26.

22 Orig'l	The State of Tennessee, Complainant, vs. The State of Arkansas et al.	The motion to set the case for and on motion to dismiss argument were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Tuesday, March 20th 1917, continued.

255	J. A. Mathiesen & Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the appellee.
256	New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Samuel Goldberg.	This cause was argued by Mr. William Mann for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.
258	Public Service Company of Northern Illinois, Appellant, vs. Stephen B. Corboy, Drainage Commissioner of the Calumet Ditch.	This cause was argued by Mr. Buell McKeever for the appellant and by Mr. John H. Gillett and Mr. Frank B. Pettit for the appellees.
261	Chesapeake & Ohio Coal & Coke Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Toledo & Ohio Central Railway Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Buckner Clay for the plaintiff in

Thursday, March 20th, 1919, continued.

Court declined to hear counsel for the defendant in error.

263

Thomas S. Haymond, Appellant, vs. Anthony Bowen et al.

On motion of Mr. John A. Howard, It is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby continued until the next term.

264

David F. Houston et al., Appellants, vs. St. Louis Independent Packing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the appellants, and by Mr. Alexander P. Rechmann for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court was adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 21st 1919, continued.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is open.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. S. Bennet, it is ordered that I. J. Hofmayer, Esquire, of Albany, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Hayden, it is ordered that Frederick William Kobbe, Esquire, and Bernard S. Van Rensselaer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Busch, it is ordered that Marion W. Reily, Esquire, of Meridian, State of Mississippi, and Raymond F. Rice, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, it is ordered that James H. Batt, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, it is ordered that Jacob Frank, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

186 William H. Odell,
Appellant,
vs.

pany et al. On motion of Mr. Samuel E. Kirby for the appellant it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced to the call for Monday March 24.

The Kentucky Heating Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
280 vs.
The City of Louisville.

This cause was continued until the next term, per stipulation of counsel.

Crescent Milling Company,
Appellant,
265 vs.
H.N. Strait Manufacturing Company et al.;
and
Crescent Milling Company,
Plaintiff in Error
266 to 270 (inc) vs.
H.N. Strait Manufacturing Company.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Harris Richardson for the appellant and plaintiff in error. Court declined to hear counsel for the appellee and defendant in error.

Mary Powers, trustee &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
272 vs.
Scott County Milling

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. James M. Flowers and Mr. William H. Watkins for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Robert H. Thompson and Mr. George Butler for the defendant in error.

273

Yazoo & Mississippi
Valley Railroad Com-
pany, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Mrs. Clara J. Mullins,
Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles N. Burch for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Marion W. Reily for the defendant in error.

274

J. W. Collett, Trustee,
&c.
Appellant,
vs.
James R. Adams.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Wilmer S. Hunt and Mr. H. B. Seay for the appellant. No appearance for the appellee.

275

S. W. Barrett
Petitioner
vs
Virginian Railway

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed

J. J. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. W. [illegible] and Mr. A. P. Hall for the respondent.

Harriet D. Moore,
Appellant
vs.
The United States.

218 This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General [illegible] for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 3d 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke

Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stevens Heckscher it is ordered that John H. Mines, Esquire, and Henry W. Moore, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court; and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. R. Fow it is ordered that Edmund D. Adcock, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Baldwin it is ordered that Wallis L. Prozes, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Close, it is ordered that Fred E. Rigg, Esquire of Geneva, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Watson E. Coleman, it is ordered that Clarence E. Pigford Esquire of Jackson, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, it is ordered that George Gill, Esquire, and John J. Bailey Esquire of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton A. Shinn it is ordered that Eugene L. McCuin, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that Robert F. Cogswell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

155 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.)

170

Union Tank Line,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William A. Wright, Comptroller General of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.)
(Mr. Justice Day concurs in the result.)

Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Clarke.

178
Dominion Hotel, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Arizona.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

220
St. Louis Poster Advertising Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of St. Louis, Henry W. Kiel, Mayor, James N. McKelvey, Commissioner of Public Buildings, and William Young, Chief of Police.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on

Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

2 The St. Louis Poster Advertising Company, Appellant, vs. City of St. Louis, Henry W. Kiel, Mayor, James N. McKelvey, Commissioner of Public Buildings, and William Young, Chief of Police.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Manila Electric Railroad and Light Company.

230

Appeal from and Error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal and the writ of error in this cause be and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Crescent Milling Company, Appellant,
vs
The H.N. Strait Manufacturing Company and Joseph A. Wessel, U.S. Marshal for the District of Minnesota.

265

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on

District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota; and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Verly Powers Trustee in Bankruptcy of Hearing Corn Company, Bankrupt, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Scott County Milling Company.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi

372

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chesapeake & Ohio Coal

261 Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Toledo & Ohio Central Railway Company. — In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

266 Crescent Milling Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The A. W. Strait Manufacturing Company. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

267 Crescent Milling Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The H. N. Strait Manufacturing Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

268 Crescent Milling Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The H. N. Strait Manufacturing Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

309 Crescent Milling Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The H. W. Strait Manufacturing Company.
In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Crescent Milling Company,

270 et al. vs.
The H. M. Stuart Manufacturing Company. | Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

22 Orig. The State of Tennessee, Complainant, vs. The State of Arkansas et al. | On consideration of the motion to set this case for oral argument on the motion to dismiss filed herein;

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case assigned for argument on Monday, April 14th next.

708 The United States, Appellant, vs. | On consideration of the motion to place this case on the summary

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

915 The United States, Appellant, vs. Herbert B. Hayden. On consideration of the motion to place this case on the Summary docket.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

192 Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ben Avon Borough et al. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alex J. Groesbeck,
Cassius L. Glasgow,
Charles S. Cunningham

759
Appellants,
vs.
Duluth & South Shore & Atlantic Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause: It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 6th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

874
Edward A. Rumely, Appellant,
vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York; and Samuel M. Hitchcock, United States Commissioner for the Southern District of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument after the cases heretofore assigned for argument on Monday April 14th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America,

881 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

911
Mark Eisner, as Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Third District of the State of New York,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
vs.
Myrtle H. Macomber.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

[illegible]
C. C. Calhoun,
Petitioner,
vs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of [illegible]

Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fidelity Title & Trust Company, Ancillary Administrator of the Estate of Vernon H. Duncan deceased, Petitioner vs. Westinghouse Electric Company.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

860

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied with reservation of and without prejudice to the right to apply for a reinstatement of the petition at any time before the end of this fail to award a new trial.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, 852 vs. Hugh Petit and Newburger Cotton Company.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

North American Telegraph Company, Petitioner, 853 vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company.	On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States

Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

851

Daly West Mining Company, James A. McIlwee & Sons et al., Petitioners
vs
Catherine Savage and John Savage et al., minors by Catherine Savage their guardian ad litem.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

867

Henry Deason, Petitioner
vs
The United States

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward E. Gold and Gold Car Heating & Lighting, Petitioners,
873 vs.
James T. Newton, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arthur L. Blunt, Petitioner,
875 vs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United

Monday, March 26th 1917, continued.

Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

883.
J. B. Gray,
Petitioner
vs.
Bank of Hartford and Claude Thompson, Sheriff of Sebastian County.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

888
Wilhelm Knauth, Oscar L. Gubelman, Rollar C. Newton and Mary W. Knauth.
Petitioners

John W. Knight, William
W. Nesbitt, William S.
Lovett, Trustees in Bankruptcy
of Knight, Yancey
& Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry A. House,
Petitioner,
870 vs.
Laurence W. Luellen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Monday, March 26th 1917, continued.

877

James F. Bishop, Administrator of the Estate of Susie B. Plamondon, deceased, et al., Petitioners
vs
Great Lakes Towing Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

878

North British & Mercantile Insurance Company, Petitioner
vs
H. Baars & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

907

Otto Higel Company, Inc., Petitioner,
vs.
Autopiano Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

— Order —

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket viz: 419, 485, 472, 708 and 915 be assigned for argument at the head of the call for Monday, April 16th next.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 26th instant to Monday, April 16th next.

Southern Oregon Company,
Appellant,
202 vs.
The United States.

The joint motion to remand the cause to the District Court with directions to modify the final decree was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee and by Mr. John M. Gearin for the appellant.

Daniel O'Connell et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
697 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
776 and 777 vs.
August Pergue et al.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the plaintiff in error.

921

W. S. G. Hughes, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James P. Lloyd, in behalf of Mr. John P. Barker for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

922

J. H. Hughes, Petitioner vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James P. Lloyd in behalf of Mr. John P. Barker for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

354

The United States, Appellant, vs. Sheridan-Kirk Contract Company and Sheridan-Kirk Contract Company.

The motion to remand these causes to the Court of Claims for additional findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

355 vs. The United States. — Sheridan-Kirk Contract Company in support of the motion, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brennan for the United States in opposition thereto

286 Luella Swartwood as sole administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company. — On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

289. Guy E. Bowman, Appellant, vs. C. W. Hammer as receiver of the First National Bank of Salmon. — On motion of Mr. Alex. Britton in behalf of counsel for the appellant, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

186 William H. Odell, Appellant, vs. F. A. Farnsworth Company et al. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr.

for the appellant. No appearance for the appellee.

293

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James N. Minds surviving and liquidating partner, &c.

On motion of Mr. James N. Minds for the defendant in error it is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby passed.

294

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James N. Minds et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. James N. Minds for the defendant in error it is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby passed.

809

Arkansas Central Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. L. Goad.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition fendant in error in opposition thereto:

835 St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. T. Dees, Jr. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

910 Pulp Wood Company, Petitioner, vs. Green Bay Paper & Fibre Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Moses Hooper for the petitioner.

916 William A. Hamilton, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George A. King, Ralph P. Potter, and Mr. James H. Hutchison and

and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

276 Richard H. Dana, Individually, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard H. Dana, Executor, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter R. Bailey for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the defendants in error.

300 Charles S. Ashley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Cushing Wait et al.

On motion of Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the defendant in error, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

279. P. W. Camp et al., Petitioners, vs. Morgan V. Gress.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. T. W. Savage for the petitioners and continued by Mr. W. Lawrence Groner and Mr. H. W. Roomes for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, March 25th 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate
Mahlon Pitney, Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. F. Shafroth, it is ordered that Frank A. Kemp, Jr., Esquire, of Boulder, State of Colorado be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Minnie B. Bergan,
Administratrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
247
vs.

	& Hudson River Railroad Company.	It is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby, passed.
279	F. W. Camp et al., Petitioners, vs. Morgan V. Gress.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William M. Thomas for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Thomas H. Wilcox for the petitioners.
281	The City of Pawhuska, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Pawhuska Oil & Gas Company, et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. T. J. Leahy for the defendants in error.
282	United Railroads of San Francisco, Appellant, vs. City & County of San Francisco et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the appellant and by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson for the appellees. Leave granted counsel for the appellees to file supplemental brief within three days.

Tuesday, March 25th 1917, continued.

283 A. P. Whatkins, Administratrix, etc., et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Birmingham & Northwestern Railway Company, Deft.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. E. Pigford for the Plaintiffs in Error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 26th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Walter A. Everman, Esquire and Charles A. Schmettau, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan it is ordered that

Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and William A. Donovan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court; and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Burkhart it is ordered that Marion H. Fisher, Esquire, of Jamestown, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

901

Kwock Jan Fat,
Petitioner
vs.
Edward White as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

298

The City of Los Angeles California, et al.,
Appellants
vs.
Los Angeles Gas & Electric

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Wednesday, March 26th 1919, continued.

299. City of Winchester et al., Appellants, vs. Winchester Water Works Company.
This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

301. T. Sanford Rose Inc., Claimant of the Scow "C-S." Appellant vs. The United States of America.
This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel.

302. Sanborn Cutting Company, Appellant, vs. V. A. Crane, as Trustee &c.
It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

283. A. P. Chalker, Administratrix etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Birmingham & Northwestern Railway Company et al.
The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. E. Pigford for the Plaintiffs in error by Mr. R. P.

Shapard for the defendants in error and, concluded by Mr. C. E. Pigford for the Plaintiffs in error.

Wednesday, March 26th 1919, continued.

254. New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioner, vs. Liebel-Binney Construction Company, et al.

and

285. New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioner, vs. Chain Belt Company, et als.

It is ordered that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed.

291. Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Nannie M. Johnson.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. George F. Haid and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Matthew A. Dyke for the respondent.

58. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Appellant, vs.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. Carter Pope and Mr. Ben Carter for the

5393

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Duncan for the appellee.

295 J. H. Hazelton et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Atlanta.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia and the plaintiffs in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute their writ of error and failing to appear, it is, in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court, thereupon, and on the motion of Mr. Walter A. Colquitt of counsel for the defendant in error now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be and the dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

296 Mary E. Gillis, Administratrix etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. New York, New Haven & Hartford

The argument of this cause was commenced by

Wednesday, March 26th 1919, continued.

J. McCarthy for the plaintiff in Error and petitioner, by Mr. John J. Hall for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 27th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson it is ordered that A. Bruce Bielaski, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and B. B. McGinnis, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. [illegible] it

Thursday, March 27th 1919, continued.

Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright it is ordered that Franklin F. Korell, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

313 Gabe E. Parker et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Eastman Richard et al.,
Co Administrators, etc.
and
563 Gabe E. Parker et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Eastman Richard et al.,
Co Administrators, etc.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the Appellants, it is ordered that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed.

Mary E. Gillis, Administratrix, etc.
Plaintiff in Error,
76 vs.
New York, New Haven and

The argument of these causes was concluded by Mr. John J. Hall for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Barbour, it is ordered that G. Hatton, Esquire, of Portsmouth, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,
Appellant,
354 vs.
Sheridan Kirk.

Sheridan-Kirk Contract Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeals from the Court of Claims.

350

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Court of Claims, on appeal and cross appeal and it appearing to the Court that the respective appellants have filed motions to dismiss their appeals,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that these appeals be, and the same are hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William F. Brothers,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

309

This cause was argued by Mr. William F. Brothers pro se and submitted by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the appellee.

Louisville and Jeffersonville Bridge Company,
vs.
The United States of America.

312

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey for the Louisville and Jeffersonville Bridge Company, the United States of America.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at Ten o'clock.

Monday, March 31st 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is open.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson it is ordered that Edward W. Engs, Esquire of Oakland State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen Wilson it is ordered that Clifford Wallace Mason, Esquire of Rochester State of New York be

counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hannis Taylor it is ordered that Thomas W. Robertson, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry A. Wise, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Ambrose B. Stannard, Appellant,	Appeal from the Court of Claims.
214. vs.	
The United States	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The United States ex rel.
William P. Grant,

111

vs.
Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Clarke.)

The United States,
Appellant,

199
vs.
The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice

8 Union Oil Company, (Plaintiff in Error,) vs. S. R. Smith. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

219 Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant, vs. Joseph J. Darlington and John W. Clapp, Trustees, Estate of John M. Clapp, deceased. Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now

Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to affirm the decree of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia dismissing the bill.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

231 Capitol Transportation Company, Petitioner, vs. Cambria Steel Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern

Monday, March 31st 1919, continued.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

58 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Purcell Envelope Company. | Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

Isabel Kouns O'Rear, Sole Surviving descendant and Sole heir of John Kouns, Surviving Partner of George L. Kouns and John Kouns and Charles Schneidau, Substituted Assignee in Bankruptcy of George L. | Appeal from the Court of Claims.

216 Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

19 Robert Miller and William Cooney,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
B. C. McClain.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter

5393

Monday, March 31st 1913, continued.

Orig.l and Nickmon Johnson, Petitioners. On consideration of the motion for leave to file Petition for writs of prohibition, mandamus and certiorari herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Justice White.

697 Daniel O'Connell, David J. Smith, Herman B. Smith, Carl J. R. Wacker, Thomas Carey and E. R. Hoffman, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

476 & 477 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. August Rogers, Thomas On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here

Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted; and these causes assigned for argument on Monday April 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

901

Kwock Jan Fat,
Petitioner,
vs.
Edward White as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

809

Arkansas Central Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. L. Goad.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pulp Wood Company, Petitioner,
910 vs.
Green Bay Paper & Fibre Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William A. Hamilton, Petitioner,
916 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

921 W. S. G. Hughes, Petitioner vs The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

922 J. H. Hughes, Petitioner vs

The United States of America. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

751 L. R. Garrett, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. | Mr. Solicitor General King of counsel for the defendant in error having filed in open Court the following certificate; to wit:

"In the Southern Division of the United States District Court for the Northern District District of California. (First Division.)

The United States of | No. 242

vs.
L. R. Garrith.

Certificate of Clerk Under Rule 9 of the United States Supreme Court.

I, Walter B. Maling, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, do hereby certify that in the case of United States of America vs. L. R. Garrith, being case numbered 212, on the Commissioners docket, of this Court, an order was duly made and entered by said District Court on the 5th day of October 1917 removing said defendant from the jurisdiction of this Court to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California; on January 5th 1918, the said defendant prayed the allowance of a writ of error to the United States Supreme Court which said writ of error was allowed and issued on February 21st 1918.

Attest my hand and the seal of the said United States District Court Northern District of California at San Francisco California, this 25th day of February

Seal

Monday, March 31st 1919, continued:

Walter B. Maling, Clerk.
By C. W. Galbreath,
Deputy Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California be, and it is hereby docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

752
L. R. Garrett,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States
of America

Mr. Solicitor General King, of counsel for the appellee having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

In the Southern Division of the United

District of California, First Division.

In the Matter of
L. R. Garrett on
habeas corpus

No. 16,280

Certificate of Clerk under rule
9, of the United States Supreme
Court.

I, Walter B. Maling, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, do hereby certify that in the matter of L. R. Garrett on habeas corpus being case numbered 16280, on the docket of the Court, the petition for writ of Habeas Corpus was filed on Sept. 29, 1917; on October 8, 1917, an order was duly made and entered by said District Court denying the petition for writ of Habeas Corpus; that on the 8th of October 1917, said Garrett prayed the allowance of an appeal from the said order to the United States Supreme Court, which said appeal was duly allowed on October 8, 1917.

Attest my hand and the
seal of the said
United States Dis-

Seal

District of California, at
San Francisco, Califor-
nia this 31st day of
January A. D. 1919.
Walter B. Maling
Clerk.
By C. W. Calbreath
Deputy Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

753 L. R. Garrett
Appellant,
vs.
The United States
of America.

Mr. Solicitor General King of counsel for the appellant having filed in open Court the following certificate

In the Southern Division of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. First Division.

In the matter of the
Application of J. R.
Garrett for writ of
certiorari

No. 16278.

Certificate of Clerk under
Rule 9, of the United States
Supreme Court.

I, Walter B. Maling, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, First Division, do hereby certify that in the matter of the application of J. R. Garrett for writ of certiorari, being case numbered 16278, on the docket of this Court, the petition for writ of certiorari was filed in this office on September 27, 1917; on October 8, 1917, an order was duly made and entered by said District Court denying the petition for writ of certiorari; that on January 5, 1918, the said J. R. Garrett prayed the allowance of an appeal from the said order to the United States Supreme Court which said ap-

Attest my hand and the seal
of the said United States
District Court, Northern
District of California
at San Francisco, State
of California, on this
25th day of March,
A. D. 1919.
Walter B. Maling, Clerk.
By C. W. Calbreath
Deputy Clerk.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by the Court that the appeal in this cause from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of J. A. Tracy, Petitioner.

This motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas

Monday, March 31st 1919, continued.

mitted to the consideration of this Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. M. O'Neill for the Petitioner.

701

R. E. Odom, Sheriff of Allen Parish, Louisiana, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
A. V. Coco, Attorney General of Louisiana.

This motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of this Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas W. Robertson and Mr. Harry P. Sneed, for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

284

New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioner
vs.
Liebel Binney Construction Company and Egbert Whitney.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Mr. Frank Chase Somes of counsel for petitioner, suggested the death of Egbert Whitney one of the respondents in this cause and moved the Court for an order under the 15th Rule to make the proper representatives parties. Whereupon: It is the proper representatives of the said Egbert Whitney, deceased, as aforesaid, shall voluntarily become parties within the first ten days of the ensuing term of this Court, the petitioners shall be entitled to open the record and, on hearing, have the decree reversed if it be erroneous: Provided, however, that a copy of this order shall be printed in some newspaper of general circulation within the State of Pennsylvania for three successive weeks at least sixty days before the beginning of the term of the Supreme Court then next ensuing — Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioner,
285 vs.
Chain Belt Company, Egbert Whitney.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Mr. Frank Chase Somes, of counsel for the petitioner, suggested the death of Egbert Whitney, one of the respondents, in this cause, and moved the Court for an order, under the 15th Rule, to make the proper representatives parties: Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that unless the deceased as aforesaid, shall voluntarily become parties within the first ten days of the ensuing term of this Court the petitioner shall be entitled to open the record and, on hearing, have the decree reversed if it be erroneous: Provided, however that a copy of this order shall be printed in some newspaper of general circulation within the State of Wisconsin for three successive weeks at least sixty days before the beginning of the term of the Supreme Court then next ensuing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

207.

New York Scaffolding Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Egbert Whitney.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Mr. Frank C. [illegible] Somes of counsel for petitioner suggested the death of Egbert Whitney, the respondent in this cause, and moved the Court for an order under the 15th Rule to make the proper representatives parties; Whereupon It is now here ordered by the Court that unless the proper representatives of the said Egbert Whitney, deceased, as aforesaid, shall voluntarily become parties within the

Court, the petitioner shall be entitled to open the record and, on motion, have the decree reversed if it be erroneous: Provided however that a copy of this order shall be printed in some newspaper of general circulation within the State of Nebraska for three successive weeks at least sixty days before the beginning of the term of the Supreme Court then next ensuing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

888 Stewart A. Hewitt, Petitioner, vs. The State of Washington. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hannis Taylor for the petitioner.

911 Maude Morrison, Administratrix, &c., Petitioner vs. Chicago, Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Homer Guerry in behalf of Mr. C. C.

Monday, March 31st 1919, continued.

George W. Korte and Mr. Herman H. Field for the respondent.

928 Roy J. Bishop, Administrator, etc., Petitioner, vs. John H. Hungate, Executor etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Thomas E. W. Bradley for the petitioner and by Mr. Felix T. Hughes for the respondents.

271 Corn Products Refining Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss their appeal has been filed.

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday March 31st 1919 continued.

The State of Wisconsin ex rel., [illegible] & Moon Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission.
In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

87

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Etta Rives née Hatton, Petitioner,
vs.
Alice K. Thompson, et al.
The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of

877.

the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. J. Van Court for the petitioner and by Mr. George S. Ramsey, for the respondent.

O. B. Live Stock Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the cons-

906

Monday, March 31st 1919, continued.

dent School District. Court on printed argument by Mr. J. M. Burton and Mr. J. H. Bailey for the petitioner.

W. C. Welch and Lizzie W. Welch,
Petitioners
923 vs.
George W. Kirby, Administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. J. N. Watson for the petitioners.

George H. Horning,
Petitioner
924 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner and by Mr. Conrad H. Syme and Mr. F. H. Marshall for the respondent.

Christopher Hannevig and Vidkunn Johnsen, as Hannevig & Johnsen,
Petitioners
925 vs.
R. W. J. Sutherland &

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

[illegible] R. Crandall and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the petitioner.

941 Hassan Abdu et als.,
Petitioners
vs.
Steamship "Nigritia" etc., Limerick Steamship Company, Ltd., Claimant.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the petitioners and by Mr. J. de Grove Potter and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondent.

943 T. M. Duche & Sons, Ltd.,
Petitioners
vs.
American Schooner "John Twohy" her tackle, etc., Albert C. Cummings and Howard Compton, Claimants.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William J. Conlen for the petitioners.

949 The United States,
Petitioner
vs.
Northern Pacific Rail-

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the cons-

Monday, March 31st, 1919, continued.

Heard on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the Petitioner and by Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 14th next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 14th 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna

Oliver Wendell Holmes

William R. Day

Willis Van Devanter

Mahlon Pitney

James C. McReynolds

Louis D. Brandeis

John H. Clarke

Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer, it is ordered that Pedro Ma. Sison, Esquire; Sabino Padilla, Esquire; Mariano Escueta, Esquire; Enrique Altavas, Esquire; V. Singson Encarnation, Esquire, Rafael Palma, Buenaventura L. Barona, Esquire, of Manila, Delfin Mahinay, Esquire, of Cadiz, Negros Occidental, Emiliano Tria Tirona, Esquire of Cavite; Jorge B. Vargas, of Sorsogon; Rafael R. Alunan, Esquire, of Bacolod, Negros Occidental; Dionisio Jakosalem, Esquire, of Cebu, Cebu, Philippine Islands; and John A. Simms, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Lake Jones, Esquire, and William M. Bostwick, Jr., Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barnette E. Moses, it is ordered that Frank S. Elgin, Esquire, A. B. Galloway, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee; Skipwith Adams, Esquire, of Helena, and John W. Arbuckle, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, April 14th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Napoleon B. Maxey, it is ordered that William J. Horton, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Loring, it is ordered that Fred G. Huntington, Esquire, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Johnford O'Brian it is ordered that William E. Allen, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that Fred V. Lowrey, Esquire, of Hillsboro, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that James A. Wayne Esquire, of Wallace, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bert L. Robison it is ordered that Charles W. Dride, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. La Follette it is ordered that Margaret W. Stewart of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Dozier A. De Vane, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Monday, April 14th 1919, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bailey it is ordered that Quintin Paredes, Esquire, and Jose Abad Santos, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron it is ordered that Leo J. Donahoe, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick T. Saussy it is ordered that Franklin H. Saffold, Esquire, of Swainsboro, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of W. A. Wagner, trading as "The American Mechanical Toy Com-

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus, the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Southern Pacific Company, Plaintiff in Error,
238 vs.
The State of Arizona.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Arizona.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

201 David F. Houston,
A. D. Melvin and
James J. Brougham,
Appellants,
vs.
St. Louis Independent
Packing Company.

Appeal from
the United
States Circuit
Court of Ap-
peals for the
Eighth Cir-
cuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

278 David H. Moore,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the
Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
291 vs.
Nannie M. Johnson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Andrew W. Barb

171 vs. The State of Georgia. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

J. E. Hathaway & Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

255

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Citizens Bank of Michigan City, Indiana, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary Opperman. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

231

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States, Appellant, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company. — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

201

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with direction to dismiss the Petition.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Corn Products Refining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
117 vs.
V. C. Eddy, B. J. Alexander,
C. H. Lerrigo, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States,
Appellant,
200 vs.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

159

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
A. C. Ochs, doing business under the name of A. C. Ochs Brick & Tile Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

204

Lake Erie & Western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

The State Public Utilities Commission of Illinois ex rel. J. S. Cameron.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

253

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Appellant and Plaintiff in error,

vs.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas.

Appeal from, and in error to the Supreme Court of The Philippine Islands

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with a direction that the cause be dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

177

Standard Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. T. Graves and W. T. Graves,
as Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further

Opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

417 W. T. McKinley and J. L. Bray, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

715 The Columbus Railway Power & Light Company, Appellant, vs. The City of Columbus, Ohio, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District ern District of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

J. Tucker Burr et al.,
Partners, doing business
under the firm name and
style of Parkinson & Burr,
Appellants,
739 vs.
The City of Columbus,
Ohio, et al.

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the South
ern District
of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

58

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Homer Gudger. — In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia.

408

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

14/1 Ana W. Mathues, Appellant, vs. Margaret Ryan.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This Cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the writ of habeas corpus.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

27 Orig. Ex Parte: In the Matter of William H. Hudgings, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein and of the argument of counsel

It is now here ordered by the Court that the Petitioner be and he is hereby discharged from custody.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

R. E. Odom, Sheriff of Allen Parish, Louisiana, Plaintiff in Error,
701 vs.
A. V. Coco, Attorney General of the State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
75 vs.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Orig'l Ex Parte In the matter of J. A. Macy, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

931 George W. Horning, Petitioner vs. The District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, had, as well as in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

T. M. Duche & Sons, Limited, Petitioner, 743 vs. American Schooner "John Twohy", her tackle, &c., Albert W. Cummins and Howard Compton, Claimants.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain
& Southern Railway
Company,
835 Plaintiff in Error,

N. Y. Trust, Jal. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

888 Stewart A. Hewett, Petitioner, vs. The State of Washington. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

894 Etha Davis, née Hutchins, Petitioner,

vs.

Mattudick, W. L. Curtis et al. — On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

911 Maud Morrison, Administratrix of the Estate of Jean Morrison deceased, Petitioner vs. Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company. — On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

C. B. Live Stock Company,
Petitioner,
906 vs.
Crosbyton Independent School District.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. C. Welch and Lizzie Welch,
Petitioners,
923 vs.
George W. Kirby, Administrator of the Estate of Mary E. Scott, deceased, Masonic Home, J. P. Tucker et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered

and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Christoffer Hannevig
and Vidkunn Johnsen,
doing business under the
name of Hannevig &
Johnsen,
Petitioners,
925 vs.
R. W. J. Sutherland and
Company.

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United
States Circuit
Court of Ap-
peals for the
Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Roy J. Bishop, Adminis-
trator of the Estate of
Clara M. Lasswell,
deceased,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
John H. Wingate, Executor
of the last will and testa

Johnson, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

941 Hassan Abdu, et al., Petitioners, vs. Steamship "Nigretia," etc., Limerick Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,

Monday, April 15th 1919, continued.

The Chief Justice announced that there will be (no session of the Court on Good Friday, the 18th instant.)

67 Dakota Central Telephone Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of South Dakota ex rel Byron S. Payne, Attorney General, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the United States.

66 Northern Pacific Railway Company and Walker D. Hines as Director General of Railroads, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of North Dakota ex rel William Langer, Attorney General.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King, Mr. John Barton Payne, Mr. Charles Donnelly and Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the Plaintiffs in error and by Mr. William Langer and Mr. F. E. Packard for the defendant in error.

427 Evalyn Chantler, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner
vs.
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Marquis Jones in behalf of Mr. J. Winston Read for the Petitioner.

311 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel, on motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the plaintiff in error.

776 and 777 The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
August Reeger et al.

Leave granted to file brief as amicus curiae on motion of Mr. Francis B. James for the National Industrial Traffic League.

Monday, April 14th 1919. continued.

757	Frederick J. Macleod and Everett E. Stone, constituting the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, Petitioners vs. New England Telephone & Telegraph Company. for the Petitioners.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, and Mr. Henry C. Attwill
757	Frederick J. Macleod and Everett E. Stone, constituting the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, Petitioners vs. New England Telephone & Telegraph Company. for the Petitioners.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, and Mr. Henry C. Attwill
954	W. W. Renfro Petitioner vs. Charles Clinton et al.	The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Napoleon B.

94 and 95

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The Southern Cotton Oil Company.

Motion to modify decree submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. D. McKenna in behalf of Mr. W. E. Hemingway, Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. J. F. Loughborough and Mr. D. H. Cantrell in support of the motion and by Mr. J. M. Moore in opposition thereto.

254

Gabe E. Parker as Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, et al., Appellants, vs. Tootie Riley a minor, by W. C. Stockton, her guardian, et al.

Leave granted to file a brief for the appellees on motion of Mr. William J. Horton in that behalf.

908

E. A. Slaughter, Petitioner vs. The United States of America

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank S. Ekin, Mr. A. B. Galloway and Mr. H.

Monday, April 14th 1919, continued.

Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

E. A. Laughter and W. W. Fisher, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — 709 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank S. Elgin, Mr. A. B. Galloway and Mr. W. E. Humphrey for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General King and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

Ex parte: In the Matter of Robert H. Thorburn, Petitioner, — 26 Orig. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Robert H. Thorburn pro se and by Mr. Augustine L. Humes and Mr. William R. Begg, for the respondent.

The Seattle Electric Company and Puget Sound Traction, Light & Power Company,

52. Appellants,

Monday, April 16th 1917, continued.

The City of Seattle et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss the appeal has been filed.

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

297 Minerva B. Cruzan, Administratrix of the Estate of Leon J. Cruzan, Plaintiff in error, vs. New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed

302

Sanborn Cutting Company,
Appellant,
vs.
W. A. Paine, as Trustee of the
Kuhn Binding & Packing
Company.

Appeal from
the United
States Circuit
Court of
Appeals for
the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

307

Alameda Mining
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Success Mining Company.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

311 Great Northern Railway Company and Minneapolis Western Railway Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Minneapolis Civic & Commerce Association and Railroad & Warehouse Commission.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

832 The Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

Maclay Hoyne, State's
Attorney, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George I. Haight and Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Addison L. Gardner, Mr. Gilbert E. Porter, Mr. Frank J. Loesch, and Timothy J. Scofield for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Fidelity Title & Trust
Company, ancillary
administrator, etc.,
Petitioner

860 vs.

The Dubois Electric
Company.

The motion to reinstate the petition for writ of certiorari herein pursuant to order of this Court of March 24th, 1919 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marcus W. Acheson Jr., for the petitioner.

Harry B. Duane and
Benton Grocery Company,
Petitioners

868 vs.

The Merchants Legal Stamp
Company et al.
and

Monday, April 14th 1919, continued.

Petitioners
869 vs.
The Merchants Legal Stamp Company et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. Boyd B. Jones for the petitioners and by Mr. Anson M. Jayman and Mr. Charles H. Perkins for the respondents.

The United States of America on the relation of Verdine R. Hall, Petitioner,
893 vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the petitioner and by Mr Solicitor General King for the respondent.

Walter L. Ross as receiver of Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner
933 vs.
Pearl D. Schooley, Administratrix -

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the con-the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles A. Schmittou and Mr. C. E. Pepe for the petitioners.

934 Eli G. Frankenstein, Petitioner, vs. Carl M. Jacobs, Trustee, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. B. Minte for the petitioner and by Mr. Walter A. McCamp and Mr. Sidney G. Stricker for the respondent.

935 Charles McKnight, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. B. B. Blakeney and Mr. J. H. Maxey for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

940 Evans M. Rawls, Petitioner, vs.

Monday, April 14th 1919, continued.

Life Insurance Company of Pennsylvania. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John S. Maxwell and Mr. George C. Bedell for the petitioner and by Mr. H. M. Bostwick, Jr., and Mr. Lokie Jones for the respondent.

979 Max Manson, Petitioner, vs. Harry S. Mesirov, Trustee, etc. et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harry Felix for the petitioner.

22 Orig. The State of Tennessee, Complainant, vs. The State of Arkansas et al. This cause was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. W. J. Lamb for the defendant in support of the motion and by Mr. Barnitte E. Moses for the complainant in opposition thereto.

R. A. F. Vaudeen, as Trustee

Monday, April 16th 1917, continued

-417- Appellant, vs. E. J. Coleman.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. (Frederick (F.)) Saussy for the appellant and continued by Mr. F. H. Saffold for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 15th 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Presser, it is ordered that William L. Freeland, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. L. Pollard, it is ordered that Henry Zittle, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

982 George J. Wagoner et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The City of La Grande, Oregon,
et al.

Mr. Wills R. King, of counsel for the defendants in error having filed in open Court the following certificate to wit:

"Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

I, Arthur S. Benson Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein George J. Wagoner, George S. Birney, Wm. McMurray, H. Lane, C. H. Bearden, A. J. Martin, Wm. Snider, Edward Burke, C. H. Moon, J. W. Heinenreich, Wm. C. Baker, June King, H. J. Underwood, Wm. Miller, Carrie J. Hilbert and Johanna Hees, on behalf of themselves and all other property owners having real property situated within what is known as the Assessment District No. 54, in the City of La Grande, Oregon, were plaintiffs and the City of La Grande, Oregon, and Lee Warnick, City Recorder and V. Palmer, J. W. McKennon and S. R. Haworth, City Commis-

Tuesday, April 15th 1919, continued.

and as Deputy City Manager, of the City of [illegible], Oregon

Oregon, and the Warren Construction Company, were defendants, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 9th day of July A.D. 1918 in favor of the said defendants and against the said plaintiffs, and that on the 7th day of October A.D. 1918, said plaintiffs sued out a writ of error to said Supreme Court directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States:-

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Supreme Court at Salem, Oregon this 7th day of March, A.D. 1919.

(Seal)

Arthur S. Benson,
Clerk"

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiffs in error have failed to have their cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon be and it is hereby docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

Daniel Donahue,
Plaintiff in Error,
319 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

The motion to continue this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo J. Donahue for the plaintiff in Error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles Henry Butler and Mr. Edward J. Brundage for the defendant in Error in opposition thereto.

The Central Trust Company of New York et al.,
Petitioners,
553 vs.
The Texas Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of Mr. N. M. Garwood for the petitioners and by Mr. Amos L. Beaty for the respondent.

R. A. Flanders, as Trustee,

119. &c., Appellant, vs. E. J. Coleman. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. F. M. Saffold for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Frederick G. Causey for the appellant.

485 William Kinzell Petitioner vs. Chicago Milwaukee & St Paul Railway. This cause was argued by Mr. J. A. Waynes for the Petitioner and by Mr. George W. Korte for the respondent.

172 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Company. Petitioner vs. Alfred H. Smith. This cause was argued by Mr. F. D. McKenney for the Petitioner and by Mr. J. Alan Goldsborough for the respondent.

708 The United States, Appellant vs. Conrad S. Babcock; and

115 Appellant, vs. Herbert B. Hayden. These causes were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the appellant and by Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

200 Frank W. Darling, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Newport News. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Marquis Jones for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. J. A. Massie for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. J. Winston Read for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, October 16th 1918

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Biddle, it is ordered that Charles J. Biddle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. Shinn, it is ordered that Everett Emmett Esquire admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ()

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Leonidas F. Bracken, Esquire, of Muncie, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ()

776 and 777
The United States,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
August Rieger, et al.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the plaintiff in error it is ordered that these cases be and they are hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, the 28th. instant.

964
Berlin Mills Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Proctor & Gamble Company,

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief for American Cotton Oil Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

301 United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs The State of Oklahoma et al.

Expiration of the terms of office of R. L. Williams, Governor, J. L. Lyon, as Secretary of State, E. B. Howard as auditor, and Frank Gault, as President of the Board of Agriculture of the State of Oklahoma suggested and appearances of J. B. A. Robertson, Governor; Joe S. Morris, as Secretary of State, F. C. Carter, as auditor, and J. N. Whitehurst, as President of the Board of Agriculture of the State of Oklahoma as parties defendants in error filed and entered, on stipulation and on motion of Mr. C. B. Ames.

865 Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Weinberger for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the defendant in error.

Edward A. Rumely, Appellant,

Thomas W. McCarthy, United States Marshal &c. et al. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Stephen C. Baldwin for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee.

881 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma et al. — This cause was argued by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, for the appellant and by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the appellees.

318 Mark Eisner as collector of United States Internal Revenue &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Myrtle H. Macomber. — This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Thursday April 17th 1919

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Breen, it is ordered that Howard Duman Brockway, Esquire, of Lafayette, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. H. R. Ogilby, it is ordered that Gordon Ireland, Esquire, of

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cha E. Hughes, it is ordered that Sumner S. Bowman, Esquire, of Millersburg, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

of Portland, State of Oregon be admitted to practice as an attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Ames it is ordered that Frederic M. Stone, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Norris it is ordered, that Charles Y. Freeman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn, accordingly.

192 Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles J. Biddle for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General King, Mr. G. Carroll Todd and Mr. Lincoln B. Black for the defendant in error

303 Hartford Beaumont, assignee of W. Boeck, Appellant and Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mauro Prieto et al. Administrators, &c, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph O'Sullivan for the appellant and plaintiff in error and by Mr. Alexander Britton for the appellees and defendants in error.

304 United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma et al.

This cause was argued Mr. C. B. Ames for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. H. L. Stuart for the defendant in error.

305 Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. Henry L. Bogart et al., &c.

Three and one half hours were allowed for the argument of this case on motion of Mr. Lewis H. Rudman in that behalf. Argument commenced by Mr. Lewis H. Rudman for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Monday, April 21st 1919.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Shelley, it is ordered that John F. McNutt, Esquire, of Rockwood, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Roscoe M. Ewing, Esquire, Shelton, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia and Thomas B. Carter, Jr., Esquire and William Fisher Esquire, of Pensacola, State of Florida be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett, it is ordered that Albert V. Gould, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, it is ordered that James B. Lucas, Esquire, and Britton H. Tabor, Esquire, of Checotah, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Gerber, it is ordered that Henry Sillcocks, Esquire, Dudley F. Phelps, Esquire, and William N. C. Marsh, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Merillat it is ordered that Leon Abbett, Esquire, of Hoboken, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan it is ordered that Alexander Paul Craki Connor, Esquire, of District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Minder, it is ordered that J. A. Gleason, Esquire, of Du Bois, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. R. Harsh, it is ordered that Tunney Bland, Esquire, of Cullman, State of Alabama be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, it is ordered that James Wilson Bayard, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

312 Louisville & Jeffersonville Bridge Company, vs. The United States of America. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Com-

242 Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joe Scarlett. | In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby reversed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this court.

(Per Mr. Justice Brandeis)

242 New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Joe Scarlett. | On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition

(Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.)

273

Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company and E. H. Ratcliff and L. W. Kennedy, its Sureties,
(Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Mrs Clara J. Mullins, Administratrix of the Estate of James Davis Mullins, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.)

(Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

273 Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Mrs. Clara J. Mullins, Administratrix, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

283 A. P. Chatkin, Administrator de bonis non of the Estate of J. W. Wright, Jr., deceased, and C. E. Wofford, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Birmingham & Northwestern Railway Company, The Jackson Construction Company, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this preme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

	United Railroads of San Francisco, Appellant,	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.
282	vs.	
	City and County of San Francisco et al.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs without prejudice to further proceedings to recover any damages to which plaintiff may be entitled.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

247 James J. Brougham and Arthur N. Stanley, Appellants, vs. Blanton Manufacturing Company.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Henry L. Rand and Edward L. Rand, Executors of Jen-

Appellants, | Appeal from
213 vs. | the Court of
The United States. | Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

Henry L. Rand and Edward L. Rand, Executors of Jennie Lathrop Rand, deceased,
Appellants,
213 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings, and of the suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for writ of certiorari herein.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

Fred A. Pixley and W. H. Crockett,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of North Carolina. — 251

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

Mary E. Gillis, Administratrix of the Estate of Alexander J. Gillis,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company. 296

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

The State of Tennessee,
Complainant
22 Orig. vs.
The State of Arkansas
et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint, answers of the defendants, and motion to dismiss the bill which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for the want of equity.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Ex Parte In the Matter
26 Orig. of Robert N. Rhodburn,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus, the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had:

It is now here ordered by the Court

changed; and that said Petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

It is further ordered that the motion for leave to file a supplemental petition herein be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

185 Oklahoma Gin Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma
and
Oklahoma Operating Company, Appellant,
494 vs
J. E. Love et al.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Fidelity Title & Trust Company, Ancillary Administrator of the Estate of Vernon H. Pancoast, deceased,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
The Du Bois Electric

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

80 James H. Cochnower, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to enter a judgment for the claimant for compensation for his services at the rate of one dollar per day from the first of July 1910 to the ed, so as to make up the difference between the four dollars per day actually received during the period stated and the five dollars per day which it is adjudged he was entitled to receive during the said period.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

202 Southern Oregon Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the joint motion made by the parties to this cause to remand this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with authority in that Court to modify the final decree in the cause so as to carry into effect the Act of Congress approved February 26th, 1919, entitled "An Act to accept from the Southern Oregon Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March third, eighteen hundred and sixty-nine, entitled 'An Act grant-in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State,' commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes."

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

Central of Georgia
Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
163 vs.
William A. Wright.

Motion for rehearing.

Per Curiam:

The application to file petition for rehearing is allowed and the rehearing is granted in so far as the validity of the tax in question is involved in or depends upon the charters of the Southwestern and the Muskogee Railroad and the subsequent relevant legislation. As to all other questions in the case, therefore, the request for leave to file the application for rehearing is denied and the case for rehearing, limited as above stated, is ordered restored to the docket for reargument.

It is further ordered that the mandate issued herein be, and the same is hereby

Monday, April 21st 1919, continued.

94	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company et al., Appellants, vs. The Southern Cotton Oil Company, and,	On consideration of the motion to modify the decree in these causes. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
95	St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company et al., Appellants, vs. The Southern Cotton Oil Company.	

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

967	Dakota Central Telephone Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. The State of South Dakota ex rel Byron S. Payne, Attorney General et al.	On considerations of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and this cause assigned for argument on Monday, May 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

976
Northern Pacific Railway
Company, and Walker
D. Hines as Director General
of Railroads,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The State of North Dakota
on the relation of William
Langer, Attorney General.

On consideration of the motions to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motions be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, May, 5th. next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

319
Daniel Donahoe,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State
of Illinois.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

832
Metropolitan West Side
Elevated Railway Com-
pany and Aurora & Elgin
& Chicago Railroad Com-
pany,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Maclay Hoyne State's
Attorney for Cook County

Illinois, and on behalf of the People of the State of Illinois.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Petitioner,
vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

749

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick J. Macleod and Everett E. Stone, constituting The Public Service Commission of Massachusetts

957

Petitioners

vs.

New England Telephone & Telegraph Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frederick J. Macleod and Everett E. Stone constituting the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts,

Petitioners

957

vs.

New England Telephone & Telegraph Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, May 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Central Trust Company of New York, International & Great Northern Railway Company, and James A. Baker, Receiver, Petitioners

553 vs.

The Texas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against it, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Harry B. Duane and Ginter Grocery Company, Petitioners

868 vs.

The Merchants Legal Stamp Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of port of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

869

Harry B. Duane,
Petitioner
vs.
The Merchants' Legal Stamp Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

893

The United States of America on the relation of Verdine R. Hall,
Petitioner,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

908 E. A. Laughter,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

909 E. A. Laughter, and
W. N. Usher,
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of
America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Monday, April 21st 1919, continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

927

Evalyn Charlton, Administratrix of the Estate of James H. Charlton, deceased,
Petitioner
vs.
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Eli G. Frankenstein,
Petitioner

Carl M. Jacobs, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Eagle Suit & Skirt Company, — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

935 Charles McKnight, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Monday, April 21st 1919, continued.

910

Edna M. Rawls, Petitioner, vs. The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this court that the said petition be, and the same is, hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

954

W. W. Renfro, Petitioner, vs. Charles Olentine, James H. Anthis, James H. Childers, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

979 Max Monson, Petitioner,
vs.
Harry S. Mesirov, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of Max Monson and Samuel T. Monson, individually etc., et al.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

689 Silas White,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error in support of the same.

Monday, April 21st 1919, continued).

912. Jacob Abrams et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King in behalf of counsel for the Plaintiffs in error; it is ordered that the bail of Hyman Rosansky, one of the Plaintiffs in error herein, be, and the same is hereby, reduced to $250.00

920 Frank C. Thornton et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Thomas J. Duffy et al., etc. The motion for an interlocutory injunction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys and Mr. Judson Harmon for the Plaintiffs in error.

803 Thomas P. Kenney as administrator, etc., Petitioner, vs. Supreme Lodge of the World, Loyal Order of Moose. The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. G. R. Harsh for the Petitioner and by Mr. E. J. Henning for

of 1.

B. F. McHarg,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Alabama Power Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas W. Martin and Mr. C. R. Hood for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Orig.

Ex parte: In the Matter of J. A. Tracy,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to renew application for writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. O'Neill for the Petitioner.

328

James A. Murray,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Kentucky Traction and Terminal Company.

In error to the Circuit Court of Franklin County, State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the Plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said

and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

321

The Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Wisconsin ex rel City of Milwaukee.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

900

W. F. Hallowell,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William P. Richardson for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the respondent.

964

Berlin Mills Company,
Petitioner
vs.
Procter & Gamble Company

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Mel

Mr. John C. Rennie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Thomas B. Kerr for the respondent, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes and Mr. Royall Victor as *amici curiae*.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
972. vs.
First Trust Company.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
973 vs.
First Trust Company; and

Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
974 vs.
First Trust Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. C. Davis and Mr. Charles A. Helsell for the petitioners and by Mr. Dennis M. Kelleher for the respondent.

Webb C. Hayes,
Plaintiff in Error,
388 vs
The Hocking Valley

The motion to dismiss in this cause was sub consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John F. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd T. Williams for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles A. Seiders for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

501

Pentress Coal & Coke Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Beecher Elmore.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. John F. McNutt for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. W. B. Miller for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

305

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Henry L. Bogert, et al., Executors, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lewis H. Freedman and Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the petitioner and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondents and concluded by Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the petitioner.

Monday, April 21st 1919, continued:

50 Orig. Ex parte: In the Matter of the United States, Petitioner.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the Petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 22d 1919

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Philip Walker it is ordered that Claude M. Gordon, Esquire, of Franklin, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Poe, it is ordered that Bruce Glidden, Esquire, of

Esquire, of Dallas and Henry E. Pharr, Esquire, of Sulphur Springs, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly. ()

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Delos G. Haynes, it is ordered that Merritt M. Blackburn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ()

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that William M. Hall, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Orig'l Ex parte In the Matter of the United States, Petitioner.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the petitioner, by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the petitioner.

Tuesday, April 22d 1919, continued.

308 American Fire Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. King Lumber & Manufacturing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Gustavus Remak Jr. for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Benjamin Micou for the defendant in error.

315 Elias C. Benedict, Appellant, vs. The City of New York.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leon Abbett for the appellant and by Mr. Terence Farley for the appellee.

316 The Washington Post Company, Petitioner, vs. John Armstrong Chaloner.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, April 23d 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf, by William H. Donovan, it is ordered that George E. Bower, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that James M. Stevens, Esquire, of Pocatello, State of Idaho, be ad-

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph Harrison it is ordered that John R. Saunders, Esquire, of Saluda, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by L. Melendez King it is ordered that Clarence McVignor, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Complainant,
vs.
State of West Virginia.

2 Orig.l

The motion for appointment of receiver and master herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. Saunders for the Complainant.

The Washington Post Company, Petitioner
vs.
John Armstrong Chaloner.

316

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Hitt the petitioner, by Mr. E. F. Colladay, and Mr. Sidney F. Hudley, for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the petitioner.

317 Christopher L. Williams, as receiver, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. William W. Potter; — It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued per stipulation.

and

318 Christopher L. Williams, as receiver, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary A. Vreeland. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Stuart G. Gibboney for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Pierre P. Garven for the defendant in error.

319. Emily K. de Ganay vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue. — This cause was argued by Mr. James Wilson Bayard for de Ganay and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the Collector.

Wednesday, April 23d 1919, continued.

The Denver & Rio
Grande Railroad
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
322 & 323. vs.
The City and County
of Denver et al.

These causes were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. M. Clark for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. James A. Marsh and Mr. Norton Montgomery for the defendants in error.

L. G. Caldwell, et al.,
Appellants,
325 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William C. Prentiss for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the appellee.

Pennsylvania Railroad
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
293 vs.
James H. Minds, surviving & liquidating partner, etc.;
and
Pennsylvania Railroad

294 Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James N. Minds et al. These causes were argued by Mr. Francis I. Gowen and Mr. Andrew R. McKenney for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. James A. Gleason for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, April 24th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol:

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. LaRue Brown, it is ordered that Harry W. Mack, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseph Schlitz Brewing
Company,
Petitioner

326 vs.

Thursday, April 24th 1919, continued.

The cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Russell Jackson for the petitioner and by Mr. W. M. Garwood for the respondents.

The Superior and Pittsburgh Copper Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
331 vs.
Frank Tomich, sometimes known as Frank Thomas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. J. Knapp for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the defendant in error.

F. Vitelli & Son,
Petitioners,
67 & 68 vs.
The United States.

These causes were argued by Mr. Albert M. Yuzzolino, for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hanson for the respondent.

C. Sanford Ross, Inc.,
Claimant of the Scow "6-S,"
301 Appellant,

Thursday April 24th 1919, continued.

The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Geo. Everett for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee.

136

L. Vass Miller et al., Appellants,
vs.
John Witham Jr. et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas K. Skinker for the appellants and by Mr. Richard P. Ralph for the appellees. Five days allowed Mr. Thomas K. Skinker to file additional brief for the appellants and five days thereafter to Mr. Richard P. Ralph to file reply for appellees thereto.

313

Gabe E. Parker et al., Appellants,
vs.
Eastman Richard et al., co-administrators, etc.;
and

563

Gabe E. Parker et al., Appellants,
vs.
Eastman Richard et al.,

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the appellants, continued by Mr. Britton

Thursday, April 24th 1919, continued

Mr. James B. Lucas for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kearful for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, April 25th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
} Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Fitzgerald it is ordered that Alexander Pfeiffer, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, it is ordered that Henry Sherman [illegible] be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly. ()

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Daniel Benson Keyblayle, Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. ()

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Shafroth, it is ordered that John Henry Fry, Esquire of Denver, and W. Barnard Welsh, Esquire, of Grand Junction, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly. ()

335 William B. Zimmerman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Corson County, South Dakota et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William G. Porter for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Clarence C.

341 Julius Wilbur, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oregon.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

342 Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. John R. Stuart et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas Watts for the petitioner and by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland for the respondents.

331 The Tayabas Land Company, assignee, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Manila Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Howard A. Bass for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the defendant in error.

332 Inspiration Consolidated Copper Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Celerino Mendez

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward W. Rice for the plaintiff in error and

Friday, April 25th 1919, continued.

Mr. Graham Foster for the defendant in error.

333.	Peter Geddes et al., Appellants, vs. Anaconda Copper Mining Company, et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 28th 1919 —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate
Mahlon Pitney — Justices.
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, it is ordered that William T. Kelly, Esquire, of Camden, State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Robert C. Bell, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham it is ordered that Victor E. Wilson, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. B. F. Macfarland, it is ordered that Henry Yewell Brady, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered, that Daniel Clay Webb, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that William Wisner

Ohio and Henry Emmett Mangham, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman it is ordered that Fred B. Hamill Esquire, of Champaign, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that Lorenzo B. da Ponte, Esquire of Tacoma, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Gower, it is ordered that Joseph W. Moonan, Esquire, of Waseca, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. W. Collett, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of David C. Cotten, Bankrupt,
Appellant,
274 vs.
James R. Adams.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice VanDevanter.

Frank W. Darling,
Plaintiff in Error,
600 vs.
City of Newport News.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals for the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme

Monday, April 28th 1919, continued.

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, - It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

277	The Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al. Appellants, vs. John M. Landon as Receiver of the Kansas Natural Gas Company et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, - It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, one half of the costs in this Court to be paid by John M. Landon, Receiver of the Kansas cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to hear it anew and determine all the issues involved, including those arising on the several bills, cross bills and answers in the nature of cross bills in conformity with the views expressed in the opinion of this Court; and to take such further proceedings as may be appropriate and consistent with such opinion.

All temporary injunctions in force at the time of the entry of the decree from which appeal was taken here shall be continued in force until otherwise ordered.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Kansas City, Missouri,
The Public Service Com-
mission of the State of
Missouri, et al.,
Appellants,
329 vs.
John M. Landon, Receiver
of the Kansas Natural
Gas Company, et al.;

Kansas City Gas Com-
pany, The Wyandotte
County Gas Company
et al.

Monday April 28th 1919 continued.

---

330 Kansas Natural Gas Company, John M. Landon, and George S. Sheritt Receivers, and Fidelity Title & Trust Company; and The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al., Appellants,

353 vs.

John M. Landon as Receiver of the Kansas Natural Gas Company, et al.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, on separate appeals and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed, one half of the costs in this Court to be paid by the said John M. Landon Receiver of the Kansas Natural Gas Company, and the remainder to be paid one third by each of the three [illegible] et al Appellants:

and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to hear it anew and determine all the issues involved, including those arising on the several bills, cross bills and answers in the nature of cross bills, in conformity with the views expressed in the opinion of this Court; and to take such further proceedings as may be appropriate and consistent with such opinion.

All temporary injunctions in force at the time of the entry of the decrees from which appeals were taken here shall be continued in force until otherwise ordered.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter of J. A. Tracy, Petitioner.

Orig. On consideration of the motion for leave to renew the petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein in the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

2 Orig'l	The Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia	On considera tion of the motion for the appoint ment herein of Receivers and of a Special

Master,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

388	Webb C. Hayes, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Hocking Valley Rail way Company.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 23rd 1917, continued.

B. F. Mcburg,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Alabama Power Company.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

504. Pentress Coal & Coke Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Becker Elmore.

In error to the
District Court
of the United
States for the
Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

803

Thomas P. Kenney, as Administrator of the Estate of Donald E. Kenney, deceased, Petitioner,

vs.

Supreme Lodge of the World Loyal Order of Moose.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

964

Berlin Mills Company, Petitioner,

vs.

Proctor & Gamble Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. P. Hallowell,
Petitioner
900. vs.
The United States
of America.

On petition for
writ of certiorari
to the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Walter L. Ross, as Receiver of Toledo, St. Louis
& Western Railroad Company,

Monday, April 23d 1917, continued.

933 Pearl J. Schooley, Administratrix of the Estate of Otto Schooley, deceased. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White)

972 Illinois Central Railroad Company, Petitioner vs First Trust Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the

Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner vs. First Trust Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

973

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Northern Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner vs. First Trust Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

974

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 2d next.

202

Southern Oregon Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee, it is ordered that the mandate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted.

999

Elizabeth A. Pendleton, Administratrix of William Bailey, deceased,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General King of counsel for the appellee having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"In the Court of Claims of the United States.

I, Saml. A. Putnam, Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Elizabeth A. Pendleton, Administratrix of William Bailey, deceased, was plaintiff, and the United States was defendant, a final decree was rendered by said Court of Claims on the thirteenth day of May, A.D. 1918, in favor of the said defendant, and against the said plaintiff, and that on the Ninth day of August, A.D. 1918 the said plaintiff prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States which was allowed October 21, 1918.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Court of Claims at Washington City this twenty-fifth day of April, A.D. 1919.

Seal.

Saml. A. Putnam,
Chief Clerk
Court of Claims."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court, that the appellant has failed to have his cause with the rules of this Court; It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause to the Court of Claims be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

657. Silas White, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King in behalf of counsel for the Plaintiff in error leave is hereby granted to file brief for the Plaintiff in error in this cause.

956. Mississippi Central Railroad Company Petitioner vs. Laura Roth Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. S. E. Travis and Mr. [illegible] for the Petitioner.

958 James Massey, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. B. C. Bachrach for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

959 Dennie Kelly et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

The Petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Ralph Crews, Mr. Judson Harmon and Mr. E. H. Moore for the Petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

963 Helen K. Kinney, Petitioner, vs. Oahu Sugar Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by

Button, Mr. Evans Browne and Mr. E. Haskel Dulby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter D. Dear, Mr. Frank E. Thompson and Mr. Robbins B. Anderson for the respondent.

984 Clarence H. Venner, etc.,
Petitioner
vs.
New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner and by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the respondents.

985 D. W. Enslen,
Petitioner
vs.
The Mechanics & Metals National Bank of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Forney Johnston for the petitioner and by Mr. Augustus Bext-

Edward Thompson et al., Petitioners,
987 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander S. Bascher for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Julius F. Smietanka, as collector of Internal Revenue, &c., Petitioner
992 vs.
American Steel Foundries.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General King & Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the petitioner and by Mr. Max Pam and Mr. H. B. Hurd for the respondent.

Union Sulphur Company, Petitioner,
993 vs.
Freeport Texas Com

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-

on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, for the petitioner and by Mr. Elihu Root, Mr. Livingston Gifford, Mr. Samuel R. Betts, Mr. James R. Sheffield and Mr. Joseph C. Fraley for the respondent.

31 Orig.ˡ

The State of Kansas,
Complainant,
vs.
Albert S. Burleson,
Postmaster General
of The United States.

The motion to set this cause for hearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. S. Jackson and Mr. A. E. Helm for the complainant.

351

Edward B. Pryor
et al., as receivers,
etc.
Petitioners,
vs.
Allega Williams.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued by stipulation.

333

Peter Geddes et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Anaconda Copper
Mining Company
et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh for the appellants.

for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh for the appellants.

327	Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Puget Sound and Willapa Harbor Railway Company.	This cause was argued by Mr. Lorenzo da Ponte for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Herman H. Field for the defendant in error.
389	Guy E. Bowerman, Appellant, vs. C. W. Hamner, Receiver of the First National Bank of Salmon.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, April 29th 1919. —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, it is ordered that John Wesley Roby, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. V. Cor

Bruson, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, it is ordered that John C. Hermann, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Dinsmore, it is ordered that Paul G. Thompson, Esquire, of Brownsville, State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abram J. Rose, it is ordered that Frank A. Pierce, Esquire, of Concord, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, April 29th 1919, continued.

The State of Kansas,
Complainant,
31 Orig'l vs.
Albert S. Burleson,
Postmaster General of
The United States
et al.

On considera-tion of the motion to assign this case for hearing, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, May 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry W. Gordon et al.,
Petitioners,
1000 vs.
Steamship "Cubadist"
Harry L. Michelson,
claimant.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-tion of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. G. B. Craighill in behalf of Mr. Alex. G. Howard for the Petitioner.

Albert S. Burleson,
Postmaster General,
Appellant,
1006 vs.
Thomas E. Dempsey
et al., as the Public

of Illinois et al. On motion of Mr. Marquis Eaton in behalf of Mr. Edward J. Brundage and Mr. George T. Buckingham for the appellees, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, May 5th next.

Louisiana Western Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
359 vs.
The City of Crowley.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, Mr. Philip S. Pugh and Mr. Henry H. Chaffe for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. P. J. Chappuis and Mr. A. P. Holt for the defendant in error.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company et al.
Appellants,
362 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

Tuesday, April 29th 1919, continued.

289 Guy E. Bowerman, Appellant, vs. C. W. Hamner, Receiver &c. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the appellant, by Mr. James M. Stevens for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the appellant.

776 and 777 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. August Deeger et al. These causes were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the defendant in error.

343 Robert L. Coleman, as administrator, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. The death of Robert L. Coleman suggested by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellant and it is ordered that this cause proceed in the name of the surviving appellant. This cause was argued by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellant and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee.

William H. Sage et al.

344. Appellants, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellee.

346 W. E. Carey, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Dakota.

This cause was submitted to the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Joe Kirby for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Clarence C. Caldwell and Mr. Edwin R. Winans for the defendant in error.

348 Raton Water Works Co. vs. The City of Raton

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. J. Rose for Raton Water Works Company.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, April 30th 1919. —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter — Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, it is ordered that Samuel Maymer Wallace, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abram J. Rose, it is ordered that John Robert

California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick A. Fenning, it is ordered that James Craig Peacock, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, it is ordered that Oscar L. Shewmake, Esquire, of Surry, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William T. Wagner et als,
Plaintiffs in Error,
363 vs.
The City of Covington;
and
Andrew C. Gilligan, doing
business under the name
of The Eagle Bottling
Works,
364 Plaintiff in Error,

The City of Covington. It is ordered that this cause be continued per stipulation of counsel.

Occidental Construction Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
The United States.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said authority it is ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank A. Bone,
Petitioner,
371 vs.
Commissioners of Marion County.

It is ordered that this cause be passed on account of the sickness of counsel.

Great Northern Railway Company,

372 vs.
The State of Washington. It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued.

377 Franklin Shaw et al., Appellants, vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior. It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued per stipulation.

348 The Raton Water Works Company, vs The City of Raton. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. J. Rose for Raton Water Works Company, by Mr. John Henry Hay, for the City of Raton and concluded by Mr. A. J. Rose for the Raton Water Works Company.

358 Bert Rucker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Marion A. Patton. It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation.

360 W. A. Hancock, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs.

Wednesday, April 30th 1919, continued.

Oklahoma et al. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. Blakeney, Mr. James H. Maxey, Mr. Grant Foreman and Mr. James D. Simms for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Nathan A. Gibson and Mr. Joseph L. Hull for the defendant in error.

365 The American Manufacturing Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis. This cause was argued by Mr. St Mayner Wallace for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Everett Paul Griffin for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday May 1st 1919 ——

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened ——

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Edna James Sheehy; Mary Annie Sinclair, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Sarah T. Andrew, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

it is ordered that Clarence E. Weir, Esquire and Charles W. Richards, Esquire of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Glassie, it is ordered that Richard M. Page, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. Hodges, it is ordered that Earle H. Turner, Esquire, of Dayton State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frederick J. Macleod
et al., constituting the
Public Service Commission of Massachusetts,
Petitioners

957 vs.

New England Telephone

Thursday, May 1st, 1919, continued.

367 Dakota Central Telephone Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of South Dakota ex rel. Byron S. Payne, Attorney General, et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General King in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to the Attorney General of the State of Ohio to file brief as *amicus curiae* in these causes.

368 Capitol Trust Company, Administrator &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. G. G. Calhoun.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

379 St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mickey Williams and Lucy Williams.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued, per stipulation of counsel.

381 Thomas J. Evans, sole surviving receiver, etc., ~~Plaintiff in Error,~~ Petitioner, vs. National Bank of

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued.

Thursday May 1st 1919, continued.

385	South Coast Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. J. C. Rudbach.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued.
386	Edward E. O'Brian et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Public Service Commission of the First District of the State of New York, et al.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued.
389	William F. Hays, Appellant, vs. The Port of Seattle, The State of Washington, et al.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued. (See stipulation)
390	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.	On motion of Mr. Ben Carter for the appellant, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed

Robert P. Ervien,
Commissioner of Public Lands of the State
of New Mexico,
Appellant,
371 vs.
The United States of
America.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued.

Orig. Ex Parte: In the Matter
of Mucanno, Limited,
Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or writ of prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reeve Lewis for the petitioner.

The Portsmouth Harbor
Land & Hotel Company, et al.,
Appellants,
381 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. John Lowell for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee.

Southern Pacific Company,
383 & Plaintiff in Error,

Thursday May 1st 1919, continued.

J. v. Temp. This cause was argued by Mr. A. F. R. Ogilby for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, May 2d 1919 - -

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. LaRue Brown, it is ordered that John C. Robinson, Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Appellant,

The United States. On motion of Mr. B. E. Barlow for the appellant it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

397.
Margaret H. Sanger,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued per stipulation.

399.
Enrique Flores Magon et al.,
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank P. Walsh for the petitioners and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for the respondent.

400
The Birge-Forbes Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Carl R. Heye.

It is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby continued.

401
Henry Peters et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs

Thomas Veasey. It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued.

402.	Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. George H. Bowles.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued.
403	Frank P. McCloskey, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.	It is ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby continued.
405.	N. Turner et al., Executors etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. J. P. Wade, Sheriff of Brooks County, Georgia.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued.
368	Capital Trust Company, Administrator etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. C. Calhoun.	This cause was argued by Mr. R. L. Edelen for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Charles F. Consaul and

Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the defendant in error.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

396 This cause was argued by Mr. Edward G. Buckland and Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Brown for the appellee. Leave granted counsel for the appellee to file brief within ten days, and to counsel for appellant to reply thereto within five days thereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, May 5th 1919. —

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened. —

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Berne H. Evans, Esquire; Frank M. Hunter, Esquire, of Harrisburg; Bernard J. Myers, Esquire, of Lancaster, State of Pennsylvania; Roger Shale, Esquire; Abram F. Myers, Esquire; Robert J. Mawhinney, Esquire; and Ferdinand Tannenbaum, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys

sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay it is ordered that Walter H. Eckert, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Barton Payne, it is ordered that Raymond S. Pruitt, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Charles C. Russell, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; and Clarence Longacre, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. McMahon it is ordered that George R. Harvey, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

it is ordered that David R. Radovsky, Esquire, of Fall River, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Ben A. Matthews, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carlos Bee, it is ordered that Herbert S. Bohnham, Esquire, of Beeville, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ogle Marbury, it is ordered that H. Findlay French, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. S. Kenyon it is of Farmer City, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Frailey it is ordered that Fred S. Holstrom, Esquire of Burlington, State of Iowa; Frank L. Hatch, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, and Homer C. Corry, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. S. Jackson it is ordered that James Q. Smith, Esquire, of Montgomery; Horace C. Wilkinson, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama. Richard J. Hopkins, Esquire, of Topeka State of Kansas, and Earle N. Floyd, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Butler

Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. T. Foster, it is ordered that Earle L. Parmelle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Cannon it is ordered that Malcolm S. McN. Watts, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. La Follette, it is ordered that M. B. Olbrich, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

Palmer it is ordered that William J. Schaffer, Esquire, of Chester, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver E. Sweet, it is ordered that Byron S. Payne, Esquire, of Pierre, and John H. Raish, Esquire, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. V. Tanner, it is ordered that Frank E. Packard, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Skinner and Eddy Corporation,

Appellant,

215 vs.

The United States of America,

Interstate Commerce Com

Monday, May 5th 1919, continued.

& Ohio Railroad Company, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

228 Standard Computing Scale Company, Limited, Appellant, vs. John D. Farrell, as State Superintendent of Weights and Measures of the State of New York. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

303 Hartford Beaumont, Assignee of W. Borck, Appellant and Plaintiff in Error.
vs.
Mauro Prieto, Benito Legarda, Jr., and Benito Valdes as administrators of the Estate of Benito Legarda, deceased, and Benito Valdes.

Appeal from and in error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Monday, May 5th 1919, continued.

348 The Raton Water Works Company, vs. The City of Raton. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified, must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank C. Thornton,
Plaintiff in Error,
920 vs.
Thomas J. Duffy, and Herbert L. Eliot members of and composing the Industrial Commission of Ohio and the Cleveland Stamping and Tool Company.

for an interlocutory injunction submitted in this case and the written consent to the allowance of the injunction in the manner and form assented to by all the parties to the record,

It is ordered that during the pendency of this action, or until the further order of this Court, the said defendants, Thomas J. Duffy and Herbert L. Eliot, members of and composing the Industrial Commission of Ohio, their associates and successors in office, be, and they hereby are, enjoined from sending notices to said Frank C. Thornton and The Cleveland Stamping and Tool Company and the other employers in Ohio on whose behalf this action was brought requiring them as a condition to their right to pay and furnish the compensation and benefits provided in Sections 1465-41a to 1465-106, General Code of Ohio, directly to their employes and their dependents, to state in writing that they do not desire to insure such payments or indemnify themselves against loss sustained by such payments; and are hereby enjoined from revoking, changing or modifying the findings of fact issued to said Frank C. Thornton and The Cleveland Stamping and Tool Company and said other employ

Industrial Commission of Ohio, who are of sufficient financial ability and credit to render certain the payment of compensation and furnishing the services to employes and their dependants as provided in Section 1465-69 General Code of Ohio, who maintain the bond required by said Commission who abide by the rules of said Commission, and who pay the required amount into the surplus of the state insurance fund as provided in said section; and said defendants are hereby enjoined from revoking, changing or modifying any of said findings of facts heretofore made to any such employers upon the sole ground that the employer desires to insure, or has insured the payment of compensations to employes or desires to indemnify or has now indemnified himself against loss sustained by direct payment thereof.

This order shall be effective upon said Frank C. Thornton and said Cleveland Stamping and Tool Company giving their joint and several bonds herein with security to the approval of the Clerk of this Court conditioned in the form and manner provided for in the moving papers governed by the consent of the Parties and according dollars.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

382
Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
J. V. Terry.
In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

383
Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. V. Terry.
In error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the said District Court and was argued

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisiana Western Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
359 vs.
The City of Crowley.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dan B. Zimmerman,
Plaintiff in Error,
335 vs.
Corson County, South Dakota, and H. A. Greene, County Treasurer of said

Monday, May 5th 1919, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex Parte In the Matter
- Orig.l of Meccano Limited,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus or a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mississippi Central
Railroad, Company,
Petitioner
956 vs.
Laura Lott, Administratrix of the Estate of
Berry Lott, deceased.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

958.

James Dorsey,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dennis Kelly, Michael
Leo Corbett, William
H. Ebert and William
H. Kelly,

959 vs.
The United States of America

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

963 Helen K. Kinney, Petitioner,
vs.
Oahu Sugar Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

984 Clarence H. Venner, etc., Petitioner vs. New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

985 D. W. Enslen, Petitioner vs. The Mechanics and Metals National Bank of the City of New York

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

(per Mr Chief Justice White.

987 Edward Thompson and Albert Ingracia, Petitioners vs. The United States of America. (On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.)

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(per Mr Chief Justice White

Julius F. Smietanka, (as collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the First District of Illinois,

992. vs.
American Steel Foundries.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

993 Union Sulphur Company, Petitioner, vs. Freeport Texas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied

1000

Henry W. Gordon, Herman Zaklit and William Bruman,
Petitioners
vs.
The Steamship "Cubadist," Harry L. Michelson, Claimant,

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

399

Enrique Flores Magon and Ricardo Flores Magon,
Petitioners
vs.
The United States of America

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

492 Ohio Valley Water Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ben Avon Borough et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be reassigned for Monday, October 13th next.

759 Alex. J. Groesbeck, Coleman C. Vaughan, Charles S. Cunningham and Addison A. Keiser, Appellants, vs. Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic Railway Company.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be reassigned for Monday October 13th next.

Order:

The Reporter having represented that, owing to the number of decisions at the present term it would be impracticable to put the reports in one volume.

It is therefore, now here ordered

in this year pursuant to section 226 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that after the conclusion of the arguments in the cases specially assigned for today the Court will take a recess until Monday the 19th instant. No petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, (except motions for admission to practice), will be received after Monday, June 2d.

741 Agnes Smedley et als.,
Appellants,
vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy,
United States Marshal
etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Assistant Attorney General O'Brian for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Gilbert E. Roe and Mr. Charles Recht for the appellant thereto.

Albert S. Burleson,

Appellant,
006 vs.
Thomas E. Dempsey
et al., constituting the
Public Utilities Commission of Illinois
et al.,

The motion to continue the Supersedeas in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellant.

Dakota Central Telephone Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
967 vs.
The State of South Dakota
ex rel. Byron S. Payne,
Attorney General, et al.

On motion of Mr. William I. Schaffer in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief of the State of Pennsylvania as *amicus curiae* in this cause.

The State of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The motion for leave to file Bill of Complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William I. Schaffer for the Complainant.

-Orig.

The State of Ohio,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of West
Virginia.

The motion for leave to file Bill of Complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Price for the Complainant.

996

Silverthorne Lumber
Company, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of
America.

The motion to admit Frederick W. Silverthorne to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic W. McKenney for the plaintiffs in error with leave to the Solicitor General to file brief within two days.

944.

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Leo L. [illegible].

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Hoehling in behalf of Mr. Fred H. Wood for the plaintiff in error

Mr. Wilson E. Hipple for the defendant in error.

Orig'l Ex parte: In the Matter of Clarence E. Ziegler, Petitioner. The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Adriaans for the Petitioner.

957 Frederick J. Macleod et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. New England Telephone & Telegraph Company.

and

967 Dakota Central Telephone Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of South Dakota, ex rel. Byron S. Payne, Attorney General et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Elmquist, leave is granted to file brief tional Association of Railroad and Public Utility Commissioners as amici curiae in this cause.)

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
986 vs.
Antonio Szary.

Petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioner and by Mr. John C. Robinson for the respondent.

Niles-Bement-Pond Company,
Appellant,
851 vs.
Iron Moulders Union Local No. 68, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell and Mr. Murray Seasongood for the appellant.

The Tug "International", her engines, etc., and the International Bridge Company,
Petitioners,
970 vs.

Monday, May 5th 1919 continued.

The petition for for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Adelbert Moot for the petitioner and by Mr. Lester F. Gilbert for the respondent.

971 Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner
vs.
William M. Collins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Adelbert Moot for the petitioner and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

988 James Gray, trustee, etc.,
Petitioner
vs.
Ella L. Moore;
and
989 James Gray, trustee, etc.,
Petitioner
vs.
Josie G. Hanrahan.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Harry H. Schutte for the petitioners and by Mr. Andrew J. Nellis for the respondents.

Monday, May 5th, 1919, continued.

The City of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska, Petitioner,
vs.
Omaha Electric Light & Power Company.

990 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Lambert for the petitioner and by Mr. William D. McHugh for the respondent.

Parlin and Orendorff Implement Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Mrs. Leona Frey.

991 The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick and Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge for the petitioner.

Northern Pacific Railway Company and Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads,
Plaintiffs in Error,

976 vs.

Dakota on the relation of William Langer, Attorney General.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John Barton Payne for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Frank E. Packard and Mr. W. F. Rammer for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles Donnelly for the plaintiffs in error.

Dakota Central Telephone Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
767 vs.
The State of South Dakota ex rel. Byron S. Payne, Attorney General, et al.

and

Frederick J. Macleod and Everett E. Stone, constituting the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts,
Petitioners,
957 vs.
New England Telephone & Telegraph Company.

The State of Kansas,
31 Complainant,

Albert S. Burleson,
Postmaster General
of the United States,
and Southwestern
Bell Telephone Company Company
and
Albert S. Burleson,
Postmaster General,
Appellant
1006 vs
Thomas E. Dempsey,
et al., etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. M. B. Olbrich, leave is granted to file brief on behalf of the State of Wisconsin as *amicus curiae* herein; On motion of Mr. Hal H. Smith, leave is granted to file brief on behalf of the City of Detroit as *amicus curiae* herein; On motion of Mr. Ogle Marbury leave is granted to file brief on behalf of the Protective Telephone Association of Baltimore as *amicus curiae* herein.

Four hours were allowed for the oral arguments in these cases.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General King for Burleson et al., and continued by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the Public Service Commission of the State of Massachusetts.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve

Tuesday, May 6, 1919

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. T. Wolhaupter, it is ordered that Hugh S. Hill, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace C. Wilkinson, it is ordered that Felix E. Blackburn, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of bama; Wilbur Ryman, Esquire, of Muncie, State of Indiana, and Lister S. Hill, Jr. Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. V. Tanner, it is ordered that Frank S. Christiansen, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. S. Jackson, it is ordered that Ledyard Park Hale, Esquire of Canton, State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Commercial Cable Company,
Appellant,
815 vs
Albert S. Burleson et al.
and
Commercial Pacific
Cable Company,

76 vs. Albert S. Burleson, et al.

The suggestion that these cases have become moot was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the appellees.

Dakota Central Telephone Company, Appellant,
767 vs.
The State of South Dakota ex rel. Byron S. Payne, Attorney General, et al.;

Frederick J. Macleod et al., &c., Petitioners,
957 vs.
New England Telephone & Telegraph Company;

The State of Kansas, Complainant,
31 Orig'l vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General &c et al.;

Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General,

1006 vs. Thomas E. Dempsey, et al.

The argument in this cause was continued by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock, for the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts; by Mr. Oliver E. Sweet, for the defendants in error in No. 967; by Mr. Fred S. Jackson for the complainant in No. 31, Original; by Mr. Raymond S. Pruitt for the appellees in No. 1006 and concluded by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the appellant in No. 1006.

1006 Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General, Appellant, vs. Thomas E. Dempsey, et al., &c., et al.

On consideration of the motion to continue the supersedeas of the final decree and the temporary injunction awarded in this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the said supersedeas and said temporary injunction be and the same are hereby continued in force until the further order of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Harvey, it is ordered that William Chandler Rogers, Esquire, Dana Taylor Gallup, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; William Millard Conner, Jr., Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands and Lodwic C. Hawes, Esquire, of Middleport, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Palmer it is ordered that William Cooke McKean, Esquire of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania; Edward J. Smith, Esquire, of Phillipsburg, State of New Jersey, and Mansfield Ferry, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Herbert Massey Peck, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma; R. E. Klugescheid, Esquire, of New York City, and William H. Ramsey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bailey it is ordered that William S. Weeks, Esquire, of Lyons, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court

in this behalf by Mr. George McClintic it is ordered that Edward T. England, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, it is ordered that John J. Dwyer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilbur Ryman, it is ordered that William F. Burns, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia and Meade Vestal, Esquire, of Noblesville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Jones, it is ordered that Melvin T. Dunlavy, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, it is ordered that John P. McCarthy, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Dutton, it is ordered that Lionel Henry Camfield, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Price, it is ordered that Edward Murphy, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Gilfrey it is ordered that B. E. Haney, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain it is ordered that John P. Hannon, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, it is ordered that Lloyd R. Freeman, Esquire, of Fairfax, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood G. Hubert, it is ordered that Solomon A. Clanton, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Tracy, it is ordered that [illegible] quire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Alfred M. Beasley, Esquire, of Linton, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, it is ordered that Truman Lenore Martin, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Shaw, it is ordered that Richard F. Fleming, Esquire of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chesapeake and Delaware

92 561
The United States of America.
In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

(Per Mr. Justice Clarke.)

William Kinzell,
Petitioner
185 vs.
Chicago Milwaukee and St Paul Railway Company.
On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is
reversed with costs; and that this cause, and the same is hereby,
hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

W. E. Carey, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Dakota.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

346

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

301

vs.

The State of

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.)

Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Plaintiffs in Error,	In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.
865 vs.	
The United States of America.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Rust Land and Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ed. Jackson, Will Scott, J. H. Nichols, A. C. Coleman, Sanders Parker, and Sam White.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

171

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

Rust Land and Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ed. Jackson, Will Scott, J. H. Nichols, A. C. Coleman, Sanders Parker and Sam	On considera tion of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here

171

ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

Annette [illegible], Petitioner

251. vs.

Albion Union State Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner

256 Samuel Goldberg.) On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

William F. Brothers,
Appellant,
309 vs.
The United States.
Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

Mackay Telegraph

Cable Company,
(Plaintiff in Error,)
374. vs.
The City of Little Rock.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railway Company, (Petitioner)
472. vs.
Alfred H. Smith.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be and the

same is hereby affirmed with costs.
(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

591

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Suda Reynolds.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, ~~and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be~~, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

John Kenney,
Petitioner,

79. Eben Miles and John L. Bird, Administrators of the Estate of Lahs Wah-Sah, deceased. | On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and
reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the
the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Gabe E. Parker, as Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes et al., Appellants,
254. vs.
Tootie Riley, a minor by N. C. Stockton, her Guardian et al. | Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of

peals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant
7 Orig^l. vs.
The State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proofs and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the boundary line between the respective States should be fixed at the middle of the channel of navigation of the Mississippi river that existed just previous to the avulsion.

It is therefore ordered that the location and determination of such boundary be fixed by a Commission of three competent persons, to be named by the Court upon the suggestion of counsel for the respective parties, such Commission to have before it the record in this case and such further proofs as it may be authorized to receive by an interlocutory decree to be entered in the case.

It is further ordered that counsel prepare and submit the form of such decree.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Ball Engineering Company, (Petitioner) vs. J. G. White & Company. 227. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Day.)

Joseph Schlitz Brewing Company, Petitioner, vs. Houston Ice & Brewing Company et al.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circ

326

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

(Per Mr. Justice Holmes.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Pitney

Louisa L. Coleman, as Administratrix of the Estate of Walter H. Coleman, deceased.
Appellant

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

343. vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William H. Sage, Henry M. Sage, and James Fenimore Cooper, Executors of the last will and testament of Henry W. Sage, deceased,
Appellants,

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

344. vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

American Fire Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.
308 vs.	
King Lumber and Manufacturing Company.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

L. G. Caldwell, and

J. A. Dunwody, co-partners,
Trading as Caldwells and
Dunwody,
Appellants,
325 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

The Tayabas Land Company,
Assignee and Successor of
Romana Velasquez et al.,
Plaintiff in Error,
331 vs.
Manila Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands,

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.
(Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs in the result).

381 The Portsmouth Harbor Land and Hotel Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

136 L. Cass Miller and Thomas K. Shinkle, Appellants, vs.
John Whitbay

Busemann, George Philipp Roth, et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
Appellant,
205 vs.
A. H. Heyward, and Fannie H. Champion, Administrators of the Estate of Andrew H. Heyward, deceased.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof the Court

being equally divided in opinion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

689

Silas White,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This Cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

815

The Commercial Cable Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Albert S. Burleson, and
Newcomb Carlton

Commercial Pacific Cable Company, Appellant,
816 vs.
Albert S. Burleson and Newcomb Carlton,

The attention of counsel for the appellants is directed to the statement made by the United States that the property whose control was at issue has been returned to its owners, and to the suggestion that as a result all the issues in the controversy have become moot, with leave to both sides to submit their printed views on the subject.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the Matter
Orig. of Clarence L. Zeigler, Petitioner

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
33 Orig. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on Monday, October 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Ohio,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of West Virginia.

34 Orig'l

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on Monday, October 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Silverthorne Lumber Company, Inc, et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

996

On consideration of the motion that Frederick W. Silverthorne, one of the plaintiffs in error herein, be admitted to bail pending the hearing of this case,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Agnes Smedley,
and Sailendra Nat
Ghose,
Appellants,
711. vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy,
United States Marshal
for the Southern District
of New York.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Mark Eisner, as
Collector of United
States Internal
Revenue for the
Third District of
the State of New
York,
Plaintiff in Error,
914 vs.
Myrtle H. Macomber

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Niles-Bement-Pond
Company,
Appellant
vs.

Iron Molders Union Local Number 68, et al. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

986

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Antonio Szary. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

971

Erie Railroad Company Petitioner vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Pacific Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Léo L. D'Utassy.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Tug "International" her engines, etc., and The International Bridge Company,
Petitioners
770 vs.
William L. McFadden et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

988 James Gray, Trustee in Bankruptcy of American Candy Manufacturing Company, Petitioner vs. Ella L. Moore.	On Petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

James Gray, Trustee in
Bankruptcy of American

Company, Petitioner
989 vs.
Josie G. Hanrahan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The City of Omaha in the State of Nebraska, Petitioner,
990 vs.
Omaha Electric Light & Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

991.
Parlin & Orendorff Implement Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Mrs. Leona Drey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel in support of the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1012.
Rensselaer & Saratoga Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
The Delaware & Hudson Company impleaded with Roscoe Irwin, Collector, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by

Mr. George B. Wellington for the petitioner

Mary Willson, as Executor
of Mrs. Kate King, a
Bankrupt,
Appellant,
197. vs.
Warren E. Bradley, Trustee,
&c.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanley W. Wilbur in behalf of the appellant.

Daniel Donahoe,
Plaintiff in Error,
319. vs.
The People of the State
of Illinois.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of Mr. Edward J. Brundage for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Leo J. Donahoe, for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
6 Orig. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. A. A. Jones, in behalf of counsel for the complainant, leave is hereby granted to file pleadings

Stephen H. P. Pell,
et al.,
Petitioners
889. vs.
W. Gordon McCabe,
Jr., et al.

The motion to advance the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William St. John Tozer for the respondents in support of the same and by Mr. Emanuel J. Myers and [illegible] Mr. Gordon S. P. Kleeberg for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

Ex parte In the matter of
Orig. 2. W. Gordon McCabe, Jr.
et al., Petitioners

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William St. John Tozer for the petitioners and by Mr. Emanuel J. Myers and Mr. Gordon S. P. Kleeberg for the respondents in opposition thereto.

Chester A. Snow,
Petitioner
997. vs.
Addie N. Snow,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. George P. Hoover for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the respondent.

Philip F. du Pont et al.,
Petitioners
101 vs.
Pierre S. du Pont et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., Mr. Henry P. Brown and Mr. Robert P. Pennington for the petitioners and by Mr. George S. Graham, Mr. George W. Pepper and Mr. William H. Button for the respondents.

Wilson Scott Morris,
Appellant,
565 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further proceedings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey J. Gerrity in behalf of Mr. L. T. Michener and Mr. William E. Russell for the appellant.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
33 Orig'l vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The motion for a preliminary injunction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the com-

No. — Elbert R. Robinson, vs. Chicago City Railway Company, and The American Car and Foundry Company.

The motion for an appeal herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Solomon P. Stanton for Robinson.

34 Orig. The State of Ohio, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia.

The motion for a preliminary injunction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J.R. Price for the complainant.

961 Elaborated Roofing Company of Buffalo, Inc., Elaborated Ready Roofing Company and Mathias B. Becker, Petitioners vs. Charles B. Bird.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said

motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Adolph Lipman, Petitioner,
926 vs.
Abraham Stummer, Jr., and Charles Buchthoefer, Executors, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Salinger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas W. O'Brien, Mr. Edward L. Young, and Mr. Alexander E. Horn, for the respondents.

Mineral Development Company, Petitioner,
965, vs.
Kentucky Coal Lands Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. J. F. Bullitt, Mr. E. L. Worthington, Mr. W. B. Dixon and Mr. S. B. Dishman for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward C. O'Rear, Mr. Henry Pitts and Mr. Edward E. Barthell for the respondent.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa
Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner
1001 vs.
Mrs. E. B. Carpenter,
Administratrix, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Evans Browne, and Mr. J. W. Terry for the petitioner and by Mr. A. J. Curtis and Mr. Winbourne Pearce for the respondent.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York,
Petitioner
1005 vs.
Chatham & Phenix,
National Bank, of the
City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank M. Patterson for the petitioner and by Mr. Leonard L. Podell for the respondent.

Harvey W. Apgar,
Petitioner.
1013 vs.
The United States of
America

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by

Thew for the Petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter for the Respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 2d. at twelve o'clock

Monday, June 2. 1919

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol,

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Matthew E. O'Brien, it is ordered that Edward Seaburn Brashears, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ottamar Hamele, it is ordered that Charles Stuart Ma donald, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King, it is ordered that Fred Blair Townsend, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona; Milton W. Mangus, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and George A. H. Fraser, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that H. B. Jones, Esquire, of Seattle, and John H. Pelletier, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Harrison S. Green, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Kimmel, it is ordered that Percy H. Moore, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Shaw, it is ordered that W. Herbert Adams, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Niels Juul, it is ordered that Ramond H. Lang, Esquire, and Charles C. Williams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates it is ordered that Noah C. Bainum, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Salomon, it is ordered that John R. Wheeler, Esquire, of Vale, State of Oregon; Thomas F. Lamb, Esquire, of Cape Girardeau, State of Missouri; and Austin L. Richardson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. J. Gerrity, it is ordered that George Gowen Parry, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul B. Cromelin, it is ordered that Bertha J. Strootman, of Buffalo, State of New York, and William H. Whitten, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Whitten it is ordered that William A. Woodruff, Esquire, of Stilwell, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raeburn Green it is ordered that Basil W. Edwards, Esquire, of Canmer, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. La Follette, it is ordered that Samuel A. Block, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. W. Lafferty it is ordered that Brinton K. Wick, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama; Lyttleton Fox, Esquire, of New York City; and Herman J. Galloway, Esquire, of Terre Haute, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as ~~an~~ attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Fitzgerald Hall, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, it is ordered that Paul Kitham, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Nicholas M. Goodlett, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Northern Pacific Railway
Company and Public
Service Commission of
the State of Washington,
Plaintiffs in Error,
327 vs.
Puget Sound & Willa

Market Railway Company.) In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

599. Minerals Separation, Limited; Minerals Separation American Syndicate, Limited, and Minerals Separation North American Corporation, Petitioners vs. Butte & Superior Mining Company, designated as Butte & Superior Copper Company, Limited). On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard

on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the is hereby reversed in part and affirmed in part, the costs in this Court to be paid by respondents; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

279 P. D. Camp, P. R. Camp, & John M. Camp, Petitioners, vs. Morgan V. Gress. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals ~~for the Fourth Circuit and was argued by counsel~~ in this cause, as to John McCamp be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia with directions to dismiss the suit as to him.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, as to P. D. and P. R. Camp, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

315	Elias C. Benedict, Appellant vs. The City of New York.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be [illegible]

the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States,
Appellant,
708 vs.
Conrad S. Babcock.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

The United States,
Appellant,
915 vs.
Herbert B. Hayden

Appeal from the
Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

The Washington Post
Company,
Petitioner
316 vs.
John Armstrong Chaloner.

On writ of
certiorari
to the Court
of Appeals
of the Dis-
trict of

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause, be and the same is hereby remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with instructions to grant a new trial.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

Christopher L. Williams, as Receiver of the First National Bank of Bayonne, New Jersey, Plaintiff in Error,	In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
318 vs.	
Mary A. Vreeland.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

828 The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Colgate & Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Ex parte: In the matter of the United States, Petitioner.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of prohibition and a writ of mandamus, and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that said petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, Appellant,
52 vs.
The City of Lincoln et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

301.

P. Sanford Ross, Inc., Claimant of the Scow "6-S" Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

763

Frank M. Blair Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of

In error to the District Court of the United States the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

764

Allan A. Templeton, Plaintiff in Error vs The United States of America	In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

765 Thomas P. Phillips, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. | In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice Pitney.)

766 Frank W. Blair, Appellant, vs. The United States of America and Thomas D. McCarthy, U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of New York. | Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on

District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

767 Allan A. Templeton,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States of America and Thomas D. McCarthy, U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the final order of the said District Court in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Thomas P. Phillips
Appellant,
768 vs.
The United States of
America and Thomas
D. McCarthy, U.S.
Marshal, for the
Southern District of
New York.

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the South-
ern District
of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court, that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Edward A. Rumely,
Appellant,
574 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy
United States Marshal
for the Southern District
of New York, and Samuel
M. Hitchcock, United
States Commissioner for the,

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the South-
ern District
of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court the the final order of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gabe E. Parker, Gabe E. Parker, as Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, W. M. Baker, and W. M. Baker as Cashier for the Five Civilized Tribes, Appellants, 313 vs. Eastman Richard & R. H. Martin, Co-Administrators of the Estate of Samuel Richard, deceased.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of

peals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

563	Gabe E. Parker, Gabe E. Parker, as Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, W. M. Baker, & W. M. Baker, as Cashier for the Five Civilized Tribes, Appellants, vs. Eastman Richard, and R. W. Martin, Co-administrators of the Estate of Samuel Richards, deceased.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr Justice Van Devanter

The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The City & County of Denver.

In error to the District Court of the City and County of Denver, State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the City and County of Denver, State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

322

The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City & County of Denver.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Richard H. Dana,
individually,
Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
Richard H. Dana, Executor of the Will of
Edith L. Dana and
Charles L. Burrill,
Treasurer & Receiver
General of the Common-
wealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the
Supreme
Judicial
Court of
the State
of Massa-
chusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

R. A. Flanders as Trustee
of M. L. Coleman,
Appellant,
49. vs.
E. J. Coleman

Appeal from
the District
Court of the
United States
for the South-
ern District
of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard

on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

431

The Brainard, Shaler and Hall Quarry Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Wilson B. Brice, as Sole Surviving Executor of the Last will & testament of Henry Van Schaick, deceased, and the American Surety Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr. Justice Day.)

Capitol Trust Company, Administrator of the Estate of Thomas N. Arnold, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
368 vs.
C. C. Calhoun.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice McKenna.)
(Mr. Justice Holmes concurs in result.)
(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

The Northern Pacific Railway Company and Walker D. Hines, as Director-General of Railroads,
Plaintiffs in Error,
976 vs.
The State of South Dakota on the relation of William Langer, Attorney General.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Public Service Company of Northern Illinois,
Appellant,
258 vs.
Stephen B. Corboy, Drainage Commissioner of the Calumet Ditch.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dakota Central Telephone Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
967 vs.

ex rel. Byron S. Payne, Attorney General, et als. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The State of Kansas,
Complainant
31 Orig^l vs.
Albert S. Burleson,
Postmaster General of
the United States,
Southwestern B

Telephone Company, This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and the answers of the defendants, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein, be and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs for the want of equity,

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis

Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General,
Appellant,
1006 vs.
Thomas E. Dempcy, Walter A. Shaw, Patrick J. Lucey, James H. Wilkerson and Frank H. Funk, constituting Public Utilities Commission of Illinois et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is

now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Frederick J. Macleod and Everett E. Stone, constituting the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, Petitioners vs. New England Telephone & Telegraph Company.	On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts

957

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court

Judicial Court in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,	In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.
776 vs.	
August Hoeper, Thomas M. Dugan and Robert H. Rasch.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings ~~not~~ in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:

777 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. August Berger, Thomas McDougall and Robert H. Rasch.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Pitney.

349 Daniel Donahue, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John D. Paxon, Plaintiff in Error, 240 vs. Civil Township of Lallie, Benson County, North Dakota.	In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte In the Matter of W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., and William R. Gray, Petitioners

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Elbert R. Robinson vs. Chicago City Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion submitted herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

33 Orig.l The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia

On consideration of the motion for a preliminary injunction in this cause to restrain the enforcement of the Statute of the State of West Virginia in controversy.

It is now here ordered by the Court

is hereby granted, and the injunction will issue accordingly.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
34 Orig^l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the motion for a preliminary injunction in this cause to restrain the enforcement of the Statute of the State of West Virginia in controversy,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the injunction will issue accordingly.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Scott Norris, Appellant,
565. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of the appellant remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of facts,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Stephen H. P. Pell, Charles
A. Pell, Howard H. Pell,

and Robert M. Thompson,
Petitioners
889 vs.
W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., and
William P. Gray.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Adolph Lipman,
Petitioner
926 vs.
Abraham Slimmer, Jr.,
and Charles Bechtsbefer,
Executors of the Last Will
and Testament of Abra-
Slimmer, deceased,

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mineral Development Company, Petitioner
965 vs.
Kentucky Coal Lands Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chester A. Snow, Petitioner
997 vs.
Addie N. Snow.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is

here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
1001 vs.
Mrs. E. B. Carpenter, Administratrix, of the Estate of E. B. Carpenter, deceased

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Petitioner
1005 vs.

Chatham & Phenix National Bank of the City of New York.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rensselaer & Saratoga Railroad Company, Petitioner 1012, vs. The Delaware & Hudson Company, impleaded with Roscoe Irwin, Collector, etc.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Ap- peals for the Second Cir- cuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1013 Harvey W. Agee, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1014 Philip F. du Pont et al., Petitioners, vs. Pierre S. du Pont et al. On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn for the term on Monday next, the 9th instant.

Charles Edwin Layton,
alias, &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
732 vs.
The United States of
America.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. Isaac B. Kimbrell and Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Silverthorne Lumber Company, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
996 vs.
The United States of

The motion to dismiss writ in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Myer Cohen, and Mr. William D. Guthrie for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

727 Clinton H. Pierce et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. — The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

793 Joseph V. Stilson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States; and

796 Joseph Sukys, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States — Motions to advance these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error

801 Peter Schaefer, Plaintiff in Error, vs.

Paul Vogel,
(Plaintiff in Error,
805 vs.
The United States of
America);

Louis Werner,
(Plaintiff in Error,
806 vs.
The United States of
America);

Martin Darkow,
(Plaintiff in Error,
807 vs.
The United States of
America);

Herman Lemke,
(Plaintiff in Error,
808 vs.
The United States of
America)

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the defendant in error.

Jacob Abrams et al.,
(Plaintiffs in Error,
912 vs.
The United States of
America.)

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for

755 The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Josiah V. Thompson. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Plaintiff in Error.

871 Robert F. Stroud, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr Solicitor General King for the defendant in Error.

914 Mark Eisner, as Collector, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Myrtle H. Macomber, The motion to assign this case for re-argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the Plaintiff in Error.

977 Charles Glen Collins, Appellant, vs Frank M. Miller

U.S. Marshall, &c. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for Mr. Winston Caffrey for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett and Mr. J. Zach Spearing for the appellant in opposition thereto.

L. R. Garrett,
Plaintiff in Error,
951 vs.
The United States of America;

L. R. Garrett
Appellant,
952. vs.
The United States of America;
and
L. R. Garrett,
Appellant,
953 vs.
The United States of America

The motion to set aside orders docketing & dismissing these cases and for leave to docket the cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Ex parte: In the matter of Charles C. Foster,
Petition Submitted

Orig.l of the Washington Asylum & Jail.

The petition for the allowance of an appeal herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King for the petitioner.

1053 Charles C. Foster, Acting Superintendent &c., Petitioner vs. Frank Joseph Goldsoll.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General King and Mr. Benjamin S. Minor for the petitioner and by Mr. J. J. Darlington, Mr. Wilton J. Lambert and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the respondent.

Orig.l Ex parte: In the Matter of the Baldwin Company, et al. Petitioners.

The petition for an appeal herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex. C. King in behalf of Mr. Lawrence Maxwell and John E. Cross for the petitioners.

1055 The Baldwin Company, Petitioner

vs.
W. S. Howard Company.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex C. King in behalf of Mr. Lawrence Maxwell and Mr. John E. Cross, for the Petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel S. Watson for the Respondent in opposition.

J. Hartley Manners,
Petitioner,
1031 vs.
Oliver Morosco.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex C. King in behalf of Mr. Walter C. Noyes, Mr. David Gerber and Mr. William J. Hughes for the Petitioner and by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the respondent.

State of Minnesota,
Complainant,
18 Orig. vs.
State of Wisconsin.

The motion to assign this cause for hearing was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg for the complainant.

Louisiana Navigation
Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
716 vs.

Louisiana, etc, et al. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Garland Dupré in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The Coca-Cola Company,
Petitioner
1007 vs.
The Koke Company of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Lehmann, Mr. Harold Hirsch, Mr. Edward S. Rogers & Mr. Frank F. Reed, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard E. Sloan and Mr. C. L. Richter, for the respondent.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company,
Petitioner
1003 vs.
L. H. Woodbury, et al.

The Petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bates, in behalf of Mr. W. J. Beall, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Rufus B. Daniel, for the respondent.

Carlos Pelle,
Petitioner,
1030 vs.
The Insular Collector
of Customs.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. W. Vandyke for the Petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General King for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
1039 vs.
Michael Bianc;

American Knife Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
1040 vs.
George Sweeting;
and
Black Knitting Company, Inc.
Plaintiff in Error,
1041 vs.
Elizabeth Vaughn.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Aiken for the defendants in error.

Joseph H. Samplinier,
Plaintiff in Error,
950 vs.
Motion Picture Patent

Motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis consideration of the Court by Mr. Eli Brandenburg, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

1018
The Asbestos & Rubber Works of America, Inc.
Petitioner
vs.
The Scandinavia Belting Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Hart Anderson and Mr. Percy B. Hopkins for the petitioner and by Mr. Nicholas M. Goodlett for the respondent.

591
Earl Neal,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Noah C. Bainum in behalf of Mr. Edward J. Brundage and Mr. Edward C. Fitch for the defendant in error in support of the motion and the motion for extension of time to file counter suggestions in opposition to motion to dismiss was submitted by Mr. Charles C. Williams and Mr. Emory J. Smith, for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edward J. Brundage & Mr. Edward C.

O. W. McBeane,
Petitioner
1038. vs.
The United States
of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Joseph M. Hill and Mr. Henry L. Fitzhugh for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter & Mr. H. E. Howard for the respondent.

Fred Browne,
Petitioner
1028. vs.
Charles B. Thorne
et al., &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner.

Meccano Limited,
Petitioner
614 vs.
John Wanamaker,
(New York.)

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the the consideration of the court by Mr. Reeve Lewis for the petitioner.

Strathearn Steamship
Company, Limited,
Petitioner
1036 vs.

Leave granted to file brief of Frederic R. Coudert.

Howard Thayer Kingsbury as amici curiae on motion of Mr. H. J. Gerrity in their behalf. Motion for leave to take part in oral argument if writ of certiorari is granted submitted by Mr. H. J. Gerrity in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert & Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury.

Charles Edwin Layton, alias &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
732. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to amend record herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell and Mr. Isaac B. Kimbrell for the plaintiff in error.

Daniel O'Connell et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
697 vs.
The United States of America.

Suggestion of diminution of the record & motion for writ of certiorari to amend the assignment of errors was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph L. Pepper for the plaintiff in error.

Pere Marquette Rail-
way Company,

1029. vs. J. T. Rusch & Company. (The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar E. Waer and Mr. John G. Shields for the petitioners and by Mr. Clare J. Hall for the respondent.)

National Brake & Electric Company, Petitioner, 1047. vs. Nils A. Christensen et al. (The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence D. Kerr, in behalf of Mr. John S. Miller, Mr. Thomas B. Kerr, Mr. Charles A. Brown, and Mr. Edward Osgood Brown for the petitioner and by Mr. Joseph B. Cotton, Mr. Willet M. Spooner, Mr. Louis Quarles & Mr. William R. Rummler for the respondents.)

John Bernot, Plaintiff in Error, 1067. vs. Peter Morrison et al. Mr. Harvey R. Gower, counsel for the defendant in error having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"In the Supreme Court of

I, C. S. Reinhart, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein John Bernot is plaintiff and appellant and Peter Morrison and Felix M. Pugh are defendants and respondents, and the State of Washington is intervenor and appellant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 19th day of October 1914 in favor of the said Peter Morrison and Felix M. Pugh and against the said John Bernot and the State of Washington, and that on the 15th day of September 1916, the said John Bernot sued out a writ of error for review of said judgment directed to remove the said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the same was allowed by the Honorable Emmett N. Parker, Chief Justice of the said Supreme Court of the State of Washington and issued from the Clerk's office of said Supreme Court of the State of Washington which writ was returnable in the Supreme Court of the United States within sixty days from the date thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed

the seal of the said
Supreme Court of
the State of Wash-
ington, at the city
of Olympia, said
State of Washington,
this 13th day of
May, 1919.

Seal.

C. S. Reinhart,
Clerk of the Supreme
Court of the State
of Washington.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the writ of error in this cause from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington be, and it is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Pacific Company,
(Petitioner)
1031 vs.
W. S. Berkshire, Temporary Administrator, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby in behalf of Mr. William J. Gilbert and Mr. W. F. Herrin for the Petitioner.

William P. Richardson,
Plaintiff in Error,
439 vs.
Liberty Oil Company, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Western Casualty
& Guaranty Insurance
Company

Plaintiff in Error,
578 vs.
Capitol State Bank
of Oklahoma City.

In error to the
Supreme Court
of the State
of Oklahoma.

It appearing to this Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

H. C. Ferris and Alexander New, Receivers of Missouri, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,
710 vs.
E. B. Shandy.

In error to
the Supreme
Court of
the State
of Okla-
homa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ohio Valley Electric
Railway Company
Plaintiff in Error,
761 vs.
J. B. Hall as administrator of the Estate of
James Brumfield, deceased.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with cost.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Dakota Central Railway Company
Petitioner
1002 vs.
Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings
Bank, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the con-
sideration

of the Court by Mr. Dore Deigen for the Petitioner.

Santa Marina Company,
Petitioner,
1008 vs.
The Canadian Bank of Commerce.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-tion of the Court by Mr. Edward W. McGraw for the Petitioner.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1010 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-tion of the Court by Mr. Evans Browne, Mr. Alexander Britton, & Mr. J. W. Terry for the Petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson, for the respondent.

J. W. Pratt, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner.
1011 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted sideration of the court by Mr. E. M. Heyburn for the Petitioner and by Mr. M. L. Countryman and Mr. A. J. Brown for the respondent.

General Fireproofing Company, Petitioner

1015 vs.

Breckinridge Jones, Trustee, etc., et al.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. W. K. Richardson and Mr. A. L. Chappell for the Petitioner and by Mr. W. H. Dyrenforth and Mr. George A. Chritton for the respondent.

José de Guzman et al., Petitioners

1016 vs.

Faustino Lichauco.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard Campbell and Mr. Felipe Buencamino, Jr., for the Petitioners and by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne for the respondent.

Lisa McCray, Petitioner,

1017 vs.

solidated Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles C. Reid for the petitioner.

Robert B. Brown,
Petitioner
109 vs.
The United States
of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, Mr. W. E. Pope and Mr. H. S. Bonham for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. W. C. Herron for the respondent.

J. W. Simpson,
Petitioner
1023 vs.
Grand International
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al.,
and
G. A. Smith,
Petitioner,
1024 vs.
Grand International

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al. — The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Wirth for the petitioners and by Mr. Matthew M. Neely for the respondents.

Colorado Title & Trust Company, Petitioner,
1025 vs.
J. T. Childress, Jr. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Barwise, Jr., and Mr. George Thompson for the petitioner and by Mr. A. L. Curtis for the respondent.

William E. Mitchell, Petitioner,
1027 vs.
R. H. Hines, Major, Field Artillery, U.S. Army. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi H. David in behalf of Mr. Alva M. Lumpkin for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and Mr. W. C. Herrera for the respondent.

Louisiana Agricultural Corporation, Petitioner,
1033. vs.
Pelican Oil Refining Company, Inc.

Petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. M. Miller for the Petitioner.

The Michigan Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1035 vs.
Ann Hope Oliver, as Administratrix, etc.

The Petitioner for a writ of of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forney Johnston for the Petitioner and by Mr. Thomas M. Stevens for the respondent.

Strathern Steamship Company, Limited, Petitioner
1036 vs.
John Dillon

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph James M. Bullowa for the Petitioner and by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury as amici curiae.

John W. Mudd and
Elizabeth E. Mudd,
Petitioners
1037 vs.
Alabama Mineral
Land Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Judson for the petitioners and by Mr. John P. Tillman for the respondent.

The New Island Lumber
Company et al.,
Petitioners
1050 vs.
The Savannah Timber
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Graydon for the petitioners and by Mr. J. J. Darlington for the respondent.

Brooks-Scanlon Company,
Petitioner
1052 vs.
Railroad Commission
of Louisiana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe and Mr. Monte M. Lemann for the petitioner and by Mr.

Meccano, Limited, Petitioner,
1054 vs.
John Wanamaker, (New York.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reeve Lewis, Mr. C. A. L. Massie, Mr. W. B. Kerkam and Mr. Ralph L. Scott for the petitioner and by Mr. Nicholas M. Goodlett for the respondent.

J. M. Thompson, Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Westmeath," &c., Petitioner
1089. vs.
Peter Lucas et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey, and Mr. L. de Grove Potter for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
John H. Clarke

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General King it is ordered that Henry Hull, Esquire, John J. Byrne, Esquire, George W. Knox, Esquire, Morris Sanger, Esquire, and Franklin W. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Harry R. McLogan, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; William A. Ryan, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York; Eustace Reynolds, Esquire, of Buffalo; Irving M. [illegible] Esquire, of Buffalo, State of

New York; Michael John Porlinski, Esquire, of Nanticoke, State of Pennsylvania; Walter Miller Burkhardt, Esquire, of Narberth, State of Pennsylvania; A. C. Carson, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, it is ordered that Sam M. Wolfe Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Lane, it is ordered that Shirley J. Holliday, Esquire, of Beach Island, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that Harold Harrison Ashby, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as

an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, it is ordered that George A. Price, Esquire and William P. Hill, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Shaw it is ordered that William H. Kelly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Lawrence H. Hedrick, Esquire, of Hot Springs, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby it is ordered that Charles E. Peddicord, Esquire of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia and James H. Baugh, Esquire, of Ballinger, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Hastings, it is ordered that Charles A. Moore, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Q. N. Alward it is ordered that Robert C. Garnett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Brooke, it is ordered that William Strauss, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Kentucky be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey it is ordered that William A. Sullivan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetter it is ordered that Charles E. Hultar, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith it is ordered that Henry E. Muehke, Esquire, of Lewiston, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, it is ordered that A. Barr Comstock, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

William H. Ohlett, Petitioner	Appeal from the District
186 vs	Court of the
H. W. Farnsworth Company, and Farnsworth	United States for the Southern
Manufacturing Co.	District of

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr Justice Clarke.)

Guy E. Bowerman, Appellant, 289. vs. C. W. Hammer, as Receiver of the First National Bank of Salmon.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs [illegible] cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Texas & Pacific Railway Company and Missouri Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas, Petitioners,
vs.
B. Leatherwood.

219.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, the Clerk's fee for supervising the printing and the cost of printing the record to be paid by the petitioners; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(The Chief Justice, Mr Justice Holmes, and Mr. Justice Day concur in the opinion.)

(Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter concurred).)

	Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
305	vs.	
	Henry L. Bogert, Townsend Lawrence, and Anita Lawrence as Executors under the last will and Testament of Walter B. Lawrence, deceased, etc., et al.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof

here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, each party to pay one half of the costs in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner. vs. Henry L. Bogert et al., Executors etc. et al.	On considera-tion of the separate petitions of Henry J. Chase, Angus Reid, Albert M.

305

Polack, Maurice P. O'Reilly and The Corn Exchange Bank for leave to intervene herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that these several petitioners be and the same are hereby denied without expressing any opinion on their merits and without prejudice to the right to apply to the District Court for leave to intervene and to share in the benefits of any decree that may be entered.

(Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,	On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.
342 vs.	
John R. Stuart, Leo Stuart and John R. Stuart, Jr., doing business under the name of John R. Stuart & Sons.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

(Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.)

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Brandeis

Mr. Justice Day, also dissents.

275	S. W. Barrett, Petitioner vs. The Virginian Railway Company.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia with direction to set aside the judgment in favor of the respondent and sustain the motion to enter a nonsuit.

The Arizona Copper Company, Limited,
(Plaintiff in Error,

20 vs.

Joseph B. Hammer

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Per Mr Justice Pitney.)

Opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Pitney, in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Clarke, concurred).

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr Justice Clarke concurred).

Dissenting opinion Mr. Justice McKenna concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice McKenna & Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Arizona Copper Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard Bray.	In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

21

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Pitney in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke concurred.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke concurred.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice McKenna and Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

	Ray Consolidated Copper Company, Plaintiff in Error,	In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.
232	vs.	
	Adam Veazey.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Pitney in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke concurred.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, concurred in by Mr Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice McKenna & Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Inspiration Consolidated Copper Company,	In error to
Plaintiff in Error,	the Supreme Court of the
332 vs.	State of
Ceferino Mendez.	Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Pitney in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke concurred.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes in which Mr. Justice Brandeis & Mr. Justice Clarke concurred.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice McKenna & Mr. Justice va[illegible]

The Superior & Pittsburgh Copper Company, Plaintiff in Error,
331 vs.
Frank Tomich, sometimes known as Frank Tomas

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged

that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Pitney, in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke, concurred.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes, in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Clarke, concurred.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna, concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Van Devanter & Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds concurred in by Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice McKenna & Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

W. A. Hancock et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
360 vs.
The City of Muskogee, Oklahoma et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be

the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

American Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error,
365 vs.
The City of St. Louis.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

T. H. Symington Company, Petitioner,
31 vs.

The National Malleable Castings Company vs. J. J. Byers

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine.

Per Mr. Justice VanDevanter.

311. William H. Minor, Petitioner, vs. The T. H. Symington Company

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Petitioners,	On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.
172 vs. E. W. McComas	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remand to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The City of Pawhuska, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Pawhuska Oil & Gas Company and the State of Oklahoma.
In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

281

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,

293

vs.
John H. Minds, Surviving & Liquidating Partner of James H. Minds and William J. Matz, lately trad

ing as Beulah Coal
Company.

In error to the
United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the
affirmed with costs, and that this cause be and the same
same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Pennsylvania Railroad
Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
294 vs.
James H. Minds, and Julia
A. Matz, trading as Beulah
Coal Company.

In error to
the United
States Circuit Court
of Appeals
for the
Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of

of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

319	Emily R. de Ganay, vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue.	On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

(See Mr. Justice Day.)

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

176

Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Western Union Telegraph Company.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

*

(See Mr. Justice Holmes.)

E. Wittle & Son

67. Petitioners vs The United States. On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the Board of General Appraisers for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

248. Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs The Western Union Telegraph Company. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by

counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

F. Vitelli & Son, Petitioners,
68 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States ~~Circuit~~ Court of Customs Appeals and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the Board of General Appraisers for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Commercial Bank

Company,
Appellant,
815 vs.
Albert S. Burleson,
and Newcomb Carlton.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to set aside its decree and to substitute a decree dismissing the bill without prejudice and without costs, because the controversy which it involves has become moot and is no longer therefore a subject for judicial action.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commercial Pacific
Cable Company,
Appellant,

816 vs.
Albert S. Burleson &c.
Newcomb Carlton.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to set aside its decree and to substitute a decree dismissing the bill without prejudice and without costs, because the controversy which it involves has become moot, and is no longer therefore a subject appropriate for judicial action.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles Edwin Layton,
alias Francis Edwin
Leighton alias Edwin
Joseph Brunswick de [illegible]

732. Plaintiff in Error, vs The United States of America. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

894. Earl Dear, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is

now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

797 Mary Willems, a creditor of Mrs. Kate King a Bankrupt,
Appellant,
vs.
Clawson E. Bradley, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Mrs Kate King, a Bankrupt.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

950 Joseph W. Sampliner,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Motion Picture Patents Company, Vitagraph Company of America, Biograph Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Orig. Ex Parte In the Matter of Charles C. Foster, Acting Superintendent of the Washington Asylum & Jail, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for the allowance of an appeal herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig. Ex parte In the Matter of the Baldwin Company and the Valley Gem Piano Company. Petitioners.

On consideration of the petition for the allowance of an appeal herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

951 L. R. Garrett, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

952 L. R. Garrett, Appellant, vs.

The United States of America;

L. R. Garrett, Appellant,

953 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to vacate and set aside the orders docketing and dismissing these cases and for leave to file the records and docket the cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Daniel O'Connell, David J. Smith, Herman B. Smith, Carl J. H. Wacker, Thomas Carey and E. R. Hoffman, Plaintiffs in Error,

697 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record herein; It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted without prejudice the matter submitted with the motion to stand as a return to the writ. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Daniel O'Connell, David J. Smith, Carl J. H. Wacker

Thomas Carey and E. R. Hoffman,
Plaintiffs in Error,
697 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion for leave to amend the assignment of errors in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Strathearn Steamship Company, Petitioner,
1036 vs.
John Dillon.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the British Embassy for leave to intervene herein as _amicus curiae_ and for leave to file brief and take part in the oral argument,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Minnesota,
Complainant,
18 Origl. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the hearing of this cause;

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr Chief Justice White.)

Mark Eisner, as Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Third District of the State of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
911 vs.
Myrtle H. Macomber.

On consideration of the motion to fix a day for the reargument of this cause;

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for re-argument on Monday, October 13th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Clinton H. Pierce, Angelo Luro, Charles Z. Zeilman and Charles Nelson,
Plaintiffs in Error,
727 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause;

It is now

here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

795 Joseph V. Stilson, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

796 Joseph Sukys, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

804 Peter Schaefer, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

805 Paul Vogel, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America;

Louis Werner, Plaintiff in Error,
806 vs.
The United States of America;

Martin Waskow, Plaintiff in Error,
807 vs.
The United States of America;
and
Herman Lemke, Plaintiff in Error,
808 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases;

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday October 13th, next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Jacob Abrams, Samuel Lipman, Hyman Rosansky et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 912 vs. The United States of America	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said

motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

755

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Josiah V. Thompson.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

811

Robert F. Stroud,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day

Louisiana Navigation Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
716 vs.
Oyster Commission of Louisiana (now Department of Conservation of Louisiana) et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause; It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The New York Central Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
1039 vs.
Michael Bianc;

American Knife Company, and Aetna Life Insurance Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,
1040 vs.
George Sweeting;

Clark Knitting Company,

Insurance Company,
(Plaintiffs in Error,
1014 vs.
Elizabeth Vaughn.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 13th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Meccano Limited,
Petitioner
614 vs.
John Wanamaker,
(New York.)

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Silverthorne Lumber Company, Inc., and Frederick W. Silverthorne, individually and as President of the Silverthorne Lumber Company,
(Plaintiffs in Error,
996 vs.
The United States of

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
977 vs.
Frank M. Miller,
U. S. Marshal for
the Eastern District
of Louisiana.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Galveston, Harrisburg &
San Antonio Railway
Company,
Petitioner,
1003 vs.
L. N. Woodbury and Vincent Woodbury.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1007
The Coca Cola Company
Petitioner
vs.
The Koke Company of America et al.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

1019
Robert B. Brown,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States of America

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the Petition

for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Petitioner
1029 vs.
J. H. French & Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this court, that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. Hartley Manners,
Petitioner
1031 vs.
Oliver Morosco

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner	On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.
1031. vs.	
W. S. Berkshire, Temporary Administrator and Personal Representative of the Estate of William A. Linder, deceased.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is, hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Strathearn Steamship Company, Limited,
Petitioner
1036 vs.
John Dillon.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

National Brake & Electric Company,
Petitioner
1047 vs
Niels A. Christiansen and Allis-Chalmers Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup port of or against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Brooks-Scanlon Company, Petitioner vs. Railroad Commission of Louisiana	On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana
1052		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	J. M. Thompson, Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Westmeath" &c., Petitioners vs. Peter Lucas and Gustav Blick.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second
1059		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Dakota Central Railway Company, Petitioner 1002 vs. Continental & Commercial Trust and Savings Bank and Frank H. Jones, as Trustees et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Santa Marina Company

(Petitioner) On Petition
1008 vs. for a writ of
The Canadian Bank certiorari
of Commerce. herein to the
United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Gulf, Colorado & Santa On Petition for
Fe Railway Com- writ of certiorari
pany. to the United
(Petitioner) States Circuit
1010 vs. Court of Ap-
The United States of peals for the
America. Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

J. W. Beatty, Administrator of the Estate of William Shearer, deceased,
Petitioner
1011 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

General Fireproofing Company,
Petitioner
1015 vs.
Breckinridge Jones, Trustee, etc. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Jose de Guzman, Ramon Soriano, Gregorio Olegario et al.,
Petitioners

1016 vs.

Faustino Lichauco.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of, as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Lora McEnery,
Petitioner

1017 vs. West Helena Consolidated Com Pany, | On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Asbestos & Rubber Works of America, Inc., Petitioner | On Petition for writ of certiorari to
1018 vs | the United States Circuit
The Scandinavia Belting Company. | Court of Appeals for the
Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. W. Simpson,
Petitioner
1023 vs.
Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of West Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of ~~the~~ as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said Petition, be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

G. A. Smith,
Petitioner
1024 vs.
Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al.

On Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the

State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Colorado Title & Trust Company, Petitioner,
1025 vs.
J. G. Childress, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1027	William E. Mikell, Petitioner, vs. F. H. Hines, Major, Field Artillery, United States Army.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White).

1028	Fred Browne, Petitioner vs. Charles B. Thorn, et al., partners doing business as Thorn & Maginnis.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Carlos Gsell,
Petitioner
1030 vs.
The Insular Collector
of Customs.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

(Per Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Louisiana Agricultural
Corporation,
Petitioner
1033 vs.
Pelican Oil Refining
Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Michigan Mutual Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner

1035 vs.

Ann Hope Oliver, as administratrix of the estate of William S. Oliver, deceased.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John H. Mudd, etc.,

Petitioners
1037 vs.
Alabama Mineral Land Company

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

T. H. M. Boone,
Petitioner
1038 vs.
The United States of America

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	The New Island Lumber Company and Van Horn S. Wilkins, Petitioners,	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.
1050	vs.	
	Savannah Timber Company.	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Charles C. Foster, Acting Superintendent of the Washington Asylum and Jail, Petitioner	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia
1053	vs.	
	Frank Joseph [illegible]	

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Meccano Limited, Petitioner
1054 vs.
John Wanamaker, New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Silverthorne Lumber Company, Inc., and Frederick

996 W. Silverthorne, Individually and as President of the Silverthorne Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the order entered herein on May 19th 1919, denying the motion to admit Frederick W. Silverthorne to bail pending the hearing of this cause be, and the same is hereby vacated and set aside.

It is further ordered that the said Frederick W. Silverthorne be enlarged to bail pending the hearing of this cause, and the amount of the bond is hereby fixed at Five thousand dollars ($5,000.00) to be approved by the Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1055 The Baldwin Company, Petitioner
vs.
R. S. Howard Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby postponed to the hearing of the case on appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Whit

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner
305 vs.
Henry L. Bogert et al.,
Executors &c., et al.

On motion of Mr. Alex. C. King in behalf of counsel, leave is granted to present a petition for a rehearing within thirty days.

Capitol Trust Company, Administrator &c.,
Plaintiff in Error,
368 vs.
C. C. Calhoun

On motion of Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the defendant in error, leave is granted to present a petition for a rehearing within thirty days.

American Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
365 vs.
The City of St. Louis.

On motion of Mr. John C. Brooke in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave is granted to present a petition for a rehearing within thirty days.

Daniel Donahoe,
Plaintiff in Error,
349 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois

On motion of Mr. Leo J. Donahoe for the Plaintiff in error, leave is granted to present petition for a rehearing within thirty days.

Order.

It is now here ordered by the Court that all the cases on the docket not decided and all the other business of the term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.